Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 37 MARCH, 1931 Number 3

EDITORIAL

Protestant Christianity and the Rise of Liberty

MANY years ago an English king asked one of his bishops to give him the best sentence argument for the truth of Christianity. The bishop replied, "The Jews, your Majesty." He meant to say that the fact of Israel in the history of the world is so unique that it evidences the Christian religion which is the flower of that nation's life and influence.

If this king and bishop had lived until the present time and the same question had been proposed, we fancy the answer would have been, "The progress of the Christian centuries, your Majesty:" for far more unique, even than Israel among the nations is the exalting influence of Jesus Christ all down the ages.

Christ's Impact on Civilization

When He was born, empires were tyrannies and slavery was universal. Today, the empires of earth are generally free, and slavery has all but been eliminated from the face of the earth. There have been many stages in the achievement of this marvelous transformation. At first the Church simply witnessed Jesus Christ, and ordered its own individual lives Christianly. It was a state within the state, having its own tribunals, passwords and signs. It was in the pagan world but not of it. This was the period of the martyrs; and yet already within this period before the centuries of persecution were over the Church had begun its ministry to the pagan world as such. When the plague broke out at Carthage during the administration of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the pagan population fled from the city, leaving their dead and dying neglected and unburied. Christian men and women remained behind, daring the scourge. They nursed the sick and buried the dead. At so early a date Christians had begun to recognize an obligation not only to each other but also to the pagan society in the midst of which they dwelt.

Shortly after this the persecutions ended, and then speedily and extensively the Church faced the duty of this wider ministry. Basilius, Bishop of Caesarea in Capadocia, built a hospital in connection with his great church. In Constantinople alone there were as many as 35 Christian hospitals before the close of the fourth century. Soon also there were asylums for orphans and for the aged as well. Slaves were redeemed, widows were cared for, and the general poor were ministered unto—(Shaff vol. II, p. 377).

Beside these things the Church faced also the duty of reforming the institutions of pagan society. Its redemption was not only for the individual but also for society itself. Far back there the Church worked for the amelioration of slavery as an institution and for the reduction of its extensiveness. It fought against the practise of exposing for death both children and aged. It challenged the popular gladiatorial show. It ennobled the institution of marriage, making it a union of souls. So slowly bit by bit it changed the stern inhumanity of pagan institutions altering them into more Christian moulds.

Corruption of the Church

And then, in the fifth century, the empire was overthrown. Much that had been gained was lost. It was a time of anarchy and of returning barbarism, but the old Roman Church held on its noble way. It ploughed Europe deep with the fact of Christ. It maintained at least in some degree the light of education

through the Dark Ages. Because it was strong, it grew influential. Because it became influential it became corrupt. Yet it never was wholly corrupt. Always it included within its fold a multitude of Christian men and women. Men like Anselm, Bernard, Francis of Assisi, Thomas a Kempis, Thomas Aquinas, and John Towler. Women like St. Clara and St. Catherine of Sienna.

Rise of Reformation

Nevertheless corruption was great and the Reformation was urgently needed. At the close of the fifteenth century the pope was the most notorious libertine and murderer in Europe. Crime was committed before the very altar, and forgiveness for a crime could be bought in advance of the commission of the deed. The Gospel was hardly preached. The Scriptures were an unknown book, to many even of the clergy. The souls of men were neglected. Then came the Reformation, not suddenly, but gradually. There was a century and a half of protest before at last the movement burst. Wycliffe made a start during the closing quarter of the fourteenth century in England. Shortly afterward Huss raised his voice in far away Bohemia. Jerome, a young scholar of Prague, also spoke out, reproving Rome's corruption. The Church burned him. Savanarola took his place and both preached and burned at Florence. Then at last with the opening of the sixteenth century Martin Luther strode forth.

It was in October, 1517, he nailed the 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg and only a decade later the Reformation was the chief interest of a continent, with armies moving and fighting in its name.

What was Reformation

What was this new movement which so quickly shook a continent and which was destined to be the creator of a new day in human history? It was not a new creed. The creed of the Reformation was the common Christian Creed of the old Roman Church. There is but a slight difference between the Gospel as held by Rome and among the Reformed Churches. Nor did Protestantism give us a new estimate of the Holy Scriptures. Rome had always believed the Bible to be the Word of God, His inspired, redemptive revelation. Its leaders taught this as clearly and believed it as firmly as did the leaders of Protestantism.

The peculiarity of the Reformation was very much less in the sphere of ideas than in that of the spirit. The Reformation was not a new faith but a new approach to faith. It was a new spirit and passion and initiative. A new fullness in men's apprehension of Christ. It was as if some divine voice had cried in the spiritual ears of a continent, "Son of man arise and stand upon thy feet and I will speak to thee;" and men had responded; they had stood up, and God had spoken to them. Says Thomas Carlisle:

> Protestantism was a revolt against spiritual sovereignties. . . Nay, I will grant that English Puritanism —revolt against earthly sovereignties—was the second act of it. That enormous French Revolution itself was the third act, whereby all sovereignties earthly and spiritual as well were abolished or made sure of abolition. Protestantism is the grand root out of which our whole subsequent European history branches out: for the spiritual will always body itself forth in the temporal history of men. The spiritual is the beginning of the temporal.

This sentence put it. The Reformation was essentially a revolt against human sovereignties; a tremendous increase in personal initiative, in the passion and purpose of religion; and in the sweep and fullness of its conception and experience of Christ and His grace.

Rome had been paternal. It had thought of men and treated them as children. It kept the Holy Scriptures from the people, giving them only such portions as might seem best adapted to their need. It conveyed to them grace through institution and sacrament. Grace was in the Eucharist. Grace was in the oil and water that had been blessed. When the Church administered these it imparted grace. Its word of absolution was authoritative. Its word of excommunication was awful with judgment.

The Reformation broke away from all this It abolished that benevolent paternalism which Rome had developed. It gave the layman the Scriptures and invited him to read them and interpret them for himself. It taught him to think of grace not as preserved in the Church and divided to men through sacraments and indulgences; but as an ocean, an atmosphere all about him. It called him to appropriate it for himself by faith; to breathe it without measure as he would. It taught him that this grace was infinite, all sufficient; that to be in relation to it was salvation, a fullness of salvation to which nothing could be added. It called upon him to achieve this relation to divine grace, and to know its achievement in his own heart apart from the intervention of any mediating human voice.

Manifestly the newness in all of this is hardly at all concerned with the substance of the Gospel; it is rather concerned with the initiative and purpose of men in approaching the Gospel. The Reformation was a new initiative, a new spirit and purpose, a new immediacy of approach to God, His Word and His grace. The Reformation stood men up in the majesty of their own responsible manhood to know in their own immediate experience the boundless tides of divine grace which stream to us in Jesus Christ.

An illustration will make it clear. We can each one remember when as small children all we knew of the world was so much as we could possess under the authority and care of our father. He guided us through its busy thoroughfares, or supervised our seeming independent journeys there. Then years afterward we were men, and the world was at our feet. All its paths were open to us. It was ours to take north, south, east or west. There is a tremendous difference between our childhood's timid contacts with the world, and our responsible fronting of it in maturity. This is the difference between Rome and the Reformation. The reformation called men to stand up before the boundless sufficiency of divine grace in Jesus Christ; to appropriate it by knowing it; to appropriate it by trusting ourselves to it; to know in our own immediate consciousness the certainty that we had touched God and that He had spoken to us.

The Sweep of the Movement

This call resulted in a passionate new interest in religion that was throbbing with vitality. It swept a continent. When the Bible had been put into English, and the great chained texts were exposed for use in the Churches crowds could be seen about them at almost any time. One would be reading; the rest would be listening. What a picture—crowds standing in Churches, where there was no service, listening to the reading of the Word of God.

Or again as it was in Holland, when the Church was not yet housed, and crowds stood for hours in the rain to listen to Reformation preaching. Religion had become the master passion of a continent. In Holland men fought through eighty long years of almost continuous war and threats of war not for liberty; but for liberty of religion.

In Germany there was the thirty years' war; and armies marched into battle singing the Reformation as choirs might sing parading the aisles of a Church—"A mighty fortress is our God." They dared fire and sword. They were burned. They were buried alive. They were exiled. They were hungry and forlorn; but they were triumphant, and the passion of their exaltation of spirit in Christ burst the bars that had held the centuries back in the middle ages. They rushed forth. They made modern history.

Every avenue of life was affected. They saw education as the common right of all. They began the enterprise, and they carried it through. They created free schools where all men might learn the elements of education. They created great universities where scholars might explore the depths of the creative wealth of the truth of Christ. They hallowed Sunday to be a day apart; a day for worship and the soul. They abolished Sunday sports that this one day might enrich their souls with divine visions otherwise impossible. They made the Bible the book of the home. It was in very fact the family Bible. They not only had it, but they knew it; they read it.

There is a vivid story which Benjamin Franklin tells of his grand-father's boyhood. He had been a child in England in the days when it was a crime for a layman to own and read in the Word of God. Franklin remembered hearing his grand-father tell how often he had stood at the front window of their English home watching against the coming of the police, while the old Puritan father had taken the family Bible down from its hiding place and read a portion of the holy word in his family. No wonder they named their children out of the Book! It was their literature, their world.

And governments too felt the influence of this creative impulse. Martin Luther was hardly gone from the scene of action before Richard Hooker was applying the truths of the reformation in a new way. He saw that the Gospel had implications concerning government. Hugo Grotius, a Dutch protestant jurist, carried Hooker's thinking further. Stuart absolutism forced the issue. English Puritanism under Cromwell won English liberty.

But the flower of the movement was in America. The Reformation had peopled these shores with men and women of conviction, of principle, of purpose, of courage. They were men and women who knew God and His Word. In His name they had looked level eyed at fire and sword and death. They had suffered hunger and thirst and exile. They had

suffered these things not as slaves are driven; but as freemen, for the sake of the principles that had made them free. Their freedom was not the petty self-indulgence of the libertine; it was rather the majesty of men whose souls were too great to be tyrannized; the majesty of such as had gazed upon the moral demand of God's own holiness. Their greatness had made them free.

The Swiss Protestant jurist Burlamaqui expressed these experiences for them in ordered thought. In his volume *Natural Law,* he showed them a form of government that harmonized with the very order of things. Later they erected a government in America. We can catch now their spirit in those ringing sentences that open our great declaration: "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Behold the religious passion that produced civil liberty.

Such was the rise of Protestant Christianity, and so did it blossom into liberty. What was it? As we have already said it was less an idea than a spirit. It was an initiative and a passion in appropriating the boundless fullness of God in Christ. It was a voice in the midst of the ages crying to men who were down upon their faces trembling with many fears and saying to them, "Son of man arise and stand upon your feet and I will speak to you." And the men and women of a continent arose; God spoke to them; and the thrilling of their hearts was so great that they burst the bars of the centuries and issued forth to create human liberty and modern history. —*H. P. S.*

Can the Blessings of Protestant Christianity be Preserved for the Future?

PROTESTANT Christianity as we have already seen, differs from Roman Christianity, chiefly in the religious initiative of its individual believers, and in the majesty and all-sufficiency of its conception of divine grace. There is but little doctrinal difference between these two great branches of the Christian Church. The peril of Rome is constantly formalsim. It is in danger of sacrificing spiritual vitality to outward observances. Its adherents are apt to be satisfied with an outward performance, accepting the Church's authoritative absolution and sacraments in lieu of an immediate personal experience of spiritual verity.

Protestant Christianity has a different, but no less real peril. It is in danger of intellectual self-sufficiency and a cooling of Christian zeal. The peril of Protestantism is periodic.

Repeatedly, since the Reformation, the Protestant Church has dropped below the level of its first noble devotion. It became deadened with intellectualism by the middle of the seventeenth century, and was quickened by the Quaker movement under George Fox in England; and by Philip Spener on the Continent. In America, the great awakening under Edwards re-energized it. Later again English Deism and Continental Rationalism greatly weakened it. Bishop Butler and the Wesleyan Revival brought it back again in England. Now since the middle of the nineteenth century, again it has been declining. The devotion of its masses is chilled. There is a failure of initiative. Its ideals are compromised and its faith is faltering.

The Initiative of Earlier Protestantism

In the days of the itinerant preachers and the great camp meetings a hundred years ago the laity had as deep a sense of responsibility to achieve spiritual conquests as did the clergy. Out on the old circuits laymen would themselves carry on extended revival campaigns. They would meet, pray, exhort, and lead penitents to the Saviour. Sometimes whole meetings would be conducted without a regular clergyman. At other times he would appear only after the meeting was well started to carry it on to further success. Sometimes he would leave in the midst of a meeting's power and go to other fields while the laymen would continue the labor.

Those fathers of our expanding American Protestantism were better read in theology and Christian literature than are Christian laymen today. They bought Watson's Institute and other theological works. They owned and used commentaries on the Bible: Clarke's, Jamison-Faucett and Brown's, Matthew Henry's. They knew their Bibles, and the system of Christian doctrine. They went to morning worship, came back for Sunday School, came back again for the evening devotion. They had their mid-

week prayer meetings and their class meetings; and all of these means of grace were steadily maintained by them. They gave themselves with united purpose to glorify Christ in the worship of His house and to carry forward the Evangel by the pressure of their own interest and activity.

From this large interest we have dropped back to the idea of one service a week and even in relation to that one we have no large sense of responsibility. Company or weather, our own social plans are allowed to interfere with the labor of glorifying Christ. Take it as a whole Protestants attend one worship service every two weeks; but they do not even so have the same high devotion and enthusiasm in this engagement that they do in their business or social relationships. Our passion is chilled. We have lost much of the constancy and devotion, the high sense of responsibility to evangelize men and to glorify the Saviour which made our fathers great.

The Holy Day

Our ideals also are seriously affected. Sunday is not as holy a day for us as it was for our fathers; its hours are not as freighted with exalted thought and emotion. The Christian Lord's Day is for us primarily a rest day and only possibly a holy day. Slowly but surely we are drifting away from Protestantism's noble ideal of a holy day; a day on which the babel and confusion of earthly interests were silenced, and the soul is given a chance to feel its sublime relationship. We are drifting toward a lower ideal which narrows the religious interest of Sunday to an hour and leaves the remainder of the day free for light social interests and excitements.

Temperence

Again, our compromised ideals have allowed the great temperance reform to become a scandal. We cannot deny it. The laboring man was greatly benefited by prohibition. Industry was made both safer and more efficient. Wealth was increased; poverty decreased; drunkenness largely disappeared; the jails were largely emptied. Then the better situated classes thought they wanted their liquor. They began to serve it. They made it seem smart to serve it; and by their selfish indulgence they encouraged the racketeer by making his business profitable. Prohibition, which was a blessing, and which we rated as a blessing, has been made a mockery and law and order in the Republic is imperilled by our compromised ideals.

Divorce

Again, and more seriously, we are allowing the divorce evil to threaten the security of the Christian home. Professor Watson and the behaviorists in psychology generally are seriously undermining it. Let Professor William McDougle, a psychologist of Drake University, warn us of the situation. He says,

"The theory that man is a machine and nothing more taught dogmatically every year to hundreds and thousands of innocent school teachers and college students will not fail in the long run to contribute very considerably to the decay of morals and the increase of crime." Marriage is reduced to "nothing more than one means of securing sexual gratification, and those relations between the sexes are best which will produce a maximum of such gratification. Watson has foretold that within fifty years marriage will have ceased to be an American institution."

Are we repudiating these false ideas? No, we are tolerating them. We want to be thought broadminded: and so we are compromising our own ideals to conform to the lower ideals we find around us.

Robbed in our Faith

Again, we are indolently allowing ourselves to be robbed in our faith. Our professors are widely seeking to reduce our Lord Jesus Christ to a mere human being, the natural son of Joseph and Mary. They are denying His virgin birth and His bodily resurrection and His Atonement for sin. Our religious education movement is substituting a theory of self-made character for the gospel of justification by faith. We are neglecting prayer and brilliant preachers are ridiculing it as supersition and ignorance. They are doing these things widely and we are doing nothing about it.

For example, it is advertised that five theological seminaries of three leading Protestant denominations are seriously modifying the faith of students for the ministry in these Churches. The modification announced amounts to Unitarianism (indeed a less vital Unitarianism than that represented by the preaching of William Ellory Channing) ; nevertheless nothing is done about it. In the Methodist Church its four leading theological seminaries as well as its curricula under its conference Boards of Ministerial Training are all more or less Unitarianized. These things cannot be denied. They are not denied; yet Unitarianism is as remote from Protestant Christianity as Buddhism, Mo-

hammedanism is. As a result of these things the advance in Protestant Christian circles, with some notable exceptions, is definitely halted; yet neither our leaders nor our masses feel any responsibility, and nothing is done about it.

Christian Civilization

Christian civilization with its Christian democracy is a better level of life that has become possible to men because Christianity and especially Protestant Christianity, with its tremendous energizing and spiritualizing of average life has been effectively maintained.

Paganism was a lower level of human society. It was the natural expression of man's social possibility as unregenerated, when dominated by egoistic motives. Paganism was incapable of freedom. It enslaved the masses. It brutalized the weak.

Christian civilization then is a summit, high above the valley of man's ordinary social possibilities; but life upon these heights can only be maintained by a firm faith and a steadfast Christian devotion. Are we maintaining them or are we coming down from the heights? This is the question!

We cannot come down—how then shall we remain upon the heights? Protestantism says, "Let us educate the masses. Let us give them the Word of God to read for themselves. Let us preach the all-sufficiency of the grace of Christ and press men into a steadfast relationship to that grace. Let us expect men generally to share in the devotion that exalts Christ and evangelizes men in His name."

Rome strikes a lower level. It says we cannot trust men generally, to so high an endeavor. It keeps the Scriptures for the clergy. It checks upon men's sins in the confessional. It judges their sincerity in absolution. Shall we fall back to these things away from the high responsibility and freedom that our fathers knew? Shall we, after our fathers died to give us the Scriptures, by our neglect lose again the Word of God? Shall we by our reduced initiative and devotion make necessary some system of confessional to keep out Protestantism from decaying . When Protestantism is vital and energized, it is conquering. When it becomes chilled and careless, it is pitifully impotent.

Rome's Faithfulness

We rejoice in Rome's firm fidelity to the faith of Christ. Rome is preaching Jesus Christ, the Son of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. It is preaching Him crucified for sin and risen from the dead. It sees His sacrifice as our justification (tho' it adds the need of human good works). It is faithful to the Holy Scriptures, maintaining their supernatural character as a divine revelation. We recognize Rome's faithfulness in all these things. We recognize it with gratitude.

Protestantism's Higher Passion—Shall it be Lost?

But we have experienced the larger initiative, the higher freedom, the divine energy of historic Protestantism. Shall we lose it? Shall we not rather seek eagerly its re-vitalization? The schools are important for they are training our ministry in unbelief. We are thinking of a preacher in the West who repeatedly attacked the faith of his Church. He was asked why he did not frankly set forth the belief, which he held. He replied: "If I should tell the people what I really believe they would close their hearts against me and I would not be able to do anything with them." He went on, "But why blame me because I do not believe as you do? I am only teaching the things I myself was taught in the schools of our Church."

We repeat, this situation is serious. It must be corrected, or else it will destroy Protestant Christianity; but the problem is very much nearer to us than this of the schools. It is in ourselves. The hour has struck. It is time we should reconsecrate ourselves to conquest in Jesus' almighty name. We must recover our Protestant initiative, as individual believers. We must recover our passion for Christ and His truth, the passion which made us what we are.

Out in Pittsburgh, the great Christ Methodist Church has closed its evening service. Other Protestant Churches are doing the same. In Newark we nearly had a bullfight on Sunday. The protest of one prominent state politician prevented it. He found the mayor of Newark sympathetic with his point of view and easily persuaded to prohibit the illegal and disgraceful thing. One wonders how many Protestant Christians of North Jersey had asserted themselves to prevent this recrudescence of paganism; this desecration of the Christian's holy day.

An educated gentleman from India was refused admittance to half a score of hotels in the city of New York because his skin was dark. Finally he was taken by the taxicab driver to a city police station and locked in a cell. The story was published in the *Literary Digest*. One wonders how many Protestant

Christian laymen of New York have protested against this shameful circumstance. That taxi cab driver in New York City had never heard of the story of the Good Samaritan. He seems to have been a stranger to the Word of God; and many boys in the communities of this nation are being brought up in similar ignorance, because so many men in America must have boys to carry their golf clubs, and must be playing their little game when both they and this whole nation should be on its knees before God.

The Way to Victory

We have lost our stride of victory. We must recover our personal faith in the sublime fact of Jesus Christ: God in flesh, virgin born and crucified for sin, risen from the dead, ascended, enthroned, the Almighty Providence of the ages, the all-sufficient Saviour of men.

We must rise above our excuses and our moral compromises that have been making us shrink from the divine presence. We must stand out in the white light of His truth and glory until our souls are purified and we are lifted into the exaltation of fellowship with Him.

We must recover our passion, our zeal, our initiative, our stride of conquest. We must withdraw ourselves from the things that do not matter, that we may give ourselves in fuller devotion to the things that do. We must lift Christ's worship above mere convenience. We must accept again the responsibility of carrying forward His Gospel, and of evangelizing men in His name.

We must give ourselves to serious reading and repossess ourselves of the knowledge of God's holy Word. We must do these things in humble faith and dependence upon Jesus Christ. If we will do these things we will be able to recover the power of our historic Protestantism and carry forward its blessings to the future generations.—*H. P. S.*

Clients' Service Bulletin

Issued in December in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred and Thirty

As of December 31st, 1930

MERE business never was of first importance anyway.

Business after all is only a means to an end—only one of many factors contributing to human happiness and cultural development, the real objectives of any civilization.

More important than business, the mechanism which merely controls production, distribution and material compensation, more important than this is the attitude of mind, the spiritual attributes motivating the acts of a people in time of stress. Do they give an affirmative answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" That is the real test of human progress. All other things are incidental.

At this Christmas season when man's good will toward man is dominant, at this time of yearly balance-casting between good and evil, between loss and gain, the credit side of the ledger looms large in these three things:

First—The willingness of those who have, to share with those who have not.

As Exhibit A we offer the Community Chests of practically all cities—filled to overflowing this year as they never were before. And this in spite of the reduced-income excuse behind which practically all contributors could have hidden.

As Exhibit B we cite the innumerable other similar projects carried out on a hitherto undreamed scale.

Temporarily baffled by the absence of a means whereby our economic machinery could be repaired immediately, en masse a generous people turn to the only means at their disposal to help their fellow human beings in distress—Charity. This they do with full realization of its unsatisfactory, inadequate and ephemeral character as a permanent solution of any problem.

Second—The absence of ruthlessness and the presence of universal effort to devise ways and means for keeping the wolf from the business door with the least distress to the fewest number of people.

Third—The desire and will to correct our economic ills.

From the highest to the lowest, there is, as never before, a universal concentrated thought and effort to that end.

And the actuating motive of it all is not individual financial gain, not self-aggrandizement, not the betterment of any single class above another, but a deeper and more sig-

nifiant thing—the recognition of man's responsibility to his fellow man.

Contrast this current state of mind and wholesome effort with that of other similar but even more serious times. Do this and we have the real measure of our progress in a thing more lastingly worth while than any material gain. There is no red in the account of Spiritual Profit and Loss. The Balance Sheet is heavy on the asset side.

The American Appraisal Company.

THESE words of a great business firm are thrillingly true; their truth is one of the most beautiful facts, and one of the most heartening of the past year. Business has not in any general way turned the economic depression to a blind selfish account by reducing incomes. There have been some reductions. There have doubtless been many unnecessary reductions; but business in the year of its crisis has shown that it has advanced far toward the Christian ideal; the leaders of industry are responsible not only to produce profits, but also and even more fundamentally to produce effective human lives.

Ever since Jesus rose, and the apostles preached with joy the message: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you," the Kingdom of God has been coming down to men out of heaven. Just how it will at last be finished no man can surely tell; but it will be finished. Thank God for this precious uplifting power and for this noble inspiring hope.—*H. P. S.*

The New Korean Methodist Church

IN *The Christian Advocate* for January 8, 1931, is a report of the new Korean Methodist Church composed of the total membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in those parts. The chief officer of the new Church is a General Superintendent named Chong-Ni-Sa, elected by the General Conference of that Church. No doctrinal test for membership is imposed. The statement on this point is briefly thus:

> Upon those persons who desire to unite with us as members we impose no doctrinal test. Our main requirement is loyalty to Jesus Christ and a purpose to follow Him. With us, as with Mr. Wesley in the earliest General Rules of the United Societies, the conditions of membership are moral and spiritual rather than theological. We sanction the fullest liberty of belief for the individual Christian, so long as his character and his works approve themselves as consistent with Godliness.

Instead of reciting the Apostles' Creed or any other they offer the following outline of "the chief doctrines, which are most surely believed among us":

> We believe in the one God, Maker and Ruler of all things, Father of all men; the source of all goodness and beauty, all truth and love.
>
> We believe in Jesus Christ, God manifest in the flesh, our Teacher, Example, and Redeemer, the Saviour of the world.
>
> We believe in the Holy Spirit, God ever present with us for guidance, for comfort and for strength.
>
> We believe in the forgiveness of sins, in the life of love and prayer, and in grace equal to every need.
>
> We believe in the Word of God contained in the Old and New Testaments as the sufficient rule both of faith and of practice.
>
> We believe in the Church as the fellowship for worship and for service of all who are united to the living Lord.
>
> We believe in the Kingdom of God as the divine rule in human society; and in the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God.
>
> We believe in the final triumph of righteousness, and in the life everlasting. Amen.

We have two criticisms of the doctrinal position of the Korean Church:

First, they have misunderstood Mr. Wesley's famous "only one condition" clause. This provision clearly applied to the initiation of a preparatory membership in the Methodist societies as a seeker, and went on immediately to fuller requirements. But take now the total doctrinal implications of the general rules:

1—That God is ethical, hating sin, and purposing finally to judge it.

2—That there is such a thing as salvation from sin.

3—That God's name is sacred.

4—That Christ's day is sacred and must be hallowed.

5—That Jesus is Lord of life, and has the right to order all its interests and efforts.

6—That there is a certain well defined body of truth known as the Gospel which is held in supreme honor.

7—That Christ is the supreme motive of all life.

8—That the Lord's Supper with its rich doctrinal content is to be steadily observed.

9—That the Bible is the only and sufficient rule of faith and life, being the inspired Word of God.

There can be no Christian fellowship on the basis of full liberty of belief. The idea is wholly impracticable; and Mr. Wesley emphatically was not an illustration of it. His famous sermon on the Catholic Spirit repudiates such latitudinarianism in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Wesley has taken as his text, "Is thy heart right as my heart is with thy heart?" He asks what is properly implied in this question when one Christian proposes it to his brethren. He answers:

> Is thy heart right with God? Dost thou believe in His being and perfections? Hast thou a divine evidence, a supernatural conviction of the things of God? Dost thou believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, "God over all, blessed forever?" Dost thou know Jesus Christ, and Him crucified? Hast thou submitted thyself unto the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ? Art thou found in Him, not having thy own righteousness, but the righteousness which is by faith?

Later he goes on to repudiate indefiniteness of faith saying:

> Observe this ye who know not what spirit ye are of; who call yourselves of catholic spirit because ye are of muddy understanding; because your mind is all in a mist; because you have no settled constant principles, but are for jumbling all opinions together. Be convinced that you have quite missed your way; you know not where you are. You think you are got into the very spirit of Christ; when in truth you are nearer the spirit of antichrist. Go, first learn the first elements of the gospel of Christ, and then shall you learn to be a truly catholic spirit.

The Korean Church has seriously misrepresented Wesley. Evidently they took action without direct investigation of what they were doing, following loose general impressions, without careful investigation.

Our other criticism is of the eight creedal paragraphs which they have substituted for the great Christian formularies of the centuries. They are seriously defective.

Paragraph II which defines the person of Christ is so loose that it would be acceptable to a Unitarian. To say that in Jesus Christ God was manifest in the flesh is not at all to say that Jesus Christ is that wonderful two-natured being, God and man, which the New Testament reveals, and the creeds affirm. God is manifest in the flesh in some degree in every good man who incarnates divine virtues. Such looseness of language would be an abomination in science; and it is equally an abomination in religion.

The Virgin Birth and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus are both omitted; yet the second of these is certainly the very rock of Christian faith. "If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain." The redemptive death of the Saviour, which is the chief emphasis of the New Testament, and which was one of the two chief truths given by St. Paul to the Church of Corinth at the opening of his ministry there, is also omitted (I Cor. 15:3ff).

One is convinced that these Korean brethren meant to write a Christian creed, and to produce a Christian Church. Their doctrine of Scripture is almost adequate, though not quite. The evangelical Church in Germany put it better some years ago when they affirmed the Bible *to be* the norm of truth, the rule of faith and life. Evidently these Korean brethren were seeking to organize a broadly tolerant, while truly Christian Church. They themselves are a vital Christian body, and we hope they will correct the mistake in their basis before it corrupts them. Indefiniteness in Christian faith inevitably leads to ineffectiveness in Christian life. Heresies of life are certain to be born upon the branches of a Church life which cherishes false beliefs in its stalk. There is not an instance in history of an heretical Church which has had an abounding and abiding fruitage in life. Truth is not the whole of life; but it is a vital part of it; and a healthy social organism must be correct in all its parts.—*H. P. S.*

* * *

If we want to live more than ordinary spiritual lives as Christian men, it is necessary that we be great feeders upon the Word of God, which is not only quick, but powerful. De Quincey divided all literature into the literature of knowledge and the literature of power; this is pre-eminently the literature of power. "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." And still further, we might make this additional statement: that without spiritual Bible study other spiritual helps may often lead us in danger, and ultimately they may be abandoned. Take the matter of meditation; without the Bible, meditation may lead a man to morbid introspection. Secret prayer is not a monologue, but is a dialogue.—*John R. Mott.*

Current Religious Thought

Comments on Current Religious Thought

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M.,D.D.

Practical Results of Humanism

Last November Dr. William Hallock Johnson, president of Lincoln University, delivered the L. P. Stone Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary. His subject was "Humanism and Theism." The lectures were timely and thoroughgoing. We have read a summary of them with much pleasure. "Once let go of supernatural or revealed religion," he said, "and religion will become vague, morals will degenerate, and the result will be spiritual and moral chaos." In his last lecture Dr. Johnson keenly analyzed Walter Lippman's book, *A Preface to Morals*. It is to be hoped that Dr. Johnson's lectures will be published in book form.

Denying the Trinity

A voluble radio talker is saying a good many things that are harmful to the cause of evangelical religion. The other day he said he would deliver an address that would harmonize the doctrines of the Unitarians and the Trinitarians. Such a statement is enough to betray the defective character of his thinking and theology. The trouble is, he is himself a Unitarian, and therefore has wrong conceptions of the doctrine of the Trinity. Some time ago a little girl asked him how Jesus, if He was God, could pray to Himself. The would-be theologian denied that Jesus is God, and admitted that it would be absurd for Him to pray to Himself. What a crude misconception! Christ is God the Son, and therefore even before His incarnation He surely could have conversed with the Father, and no doubt He did so from eternity. Then when He, the Son, humbled Himself, assumed human nature, and placed Himself under human conditions, the most consistent thing that He could do was to pray to the Father in and through His assumed human nature. There is nothing at all difficult to visualize in the holy transaction. The Unitarian gets a wrong conception of the Trinity and then denies the doctrine outright.

The Trinity not Unreasonable

Mysterious though it is, the doctrine of the Trinity is neither unthinkable nor unreasonable. Let us see. You and I have self-consciousness. But that is a great mystery. How can an entity know itself? How can it be subject and object at the same time? To be able to think of yourself, to make yourself your own object, is as profound a mystery as one can contemplate. And yet we know that it is a fact—each person does know himself. Now, it is just as easy to think of a being who has a threefold consciousness as of a being who has only a single consciousness. That is what we mean by the Trinity—the Divine Being with three powers of self-consciousness; that is, one being and three persons. The core and essence of personality is self-consciousness. Any kind of a being who has Egoity, Ihood, Selfhood, is a person. Hence there can be and are three Persons in the one Godhead.

The Greatness of Spiritual Values

Although we have, in another department, taken occasion to criticise Dr. Edgar S. Brightman's theory of a finite God as set forth in his book, *The Problem of God,* we commend his pointed dealing with atheists. Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes makes much of the vast space of the physical universe as an argument against God. In reply, Dr. Brightman says (p. 142): "In so doing, he overlooks the fact that this vastness is but a tribute to the power of the Creator; that man's insignificance in space is no measure of his spiritual value, since value has nothing to do with mere size or extent; and that man's power to know the truths of astronomy is a triumph of personality." How true! Man as a self-conscious, sentient, moral and spiritual personality is of greater qualitative value than all the material and non-conscious suns, moons and stars of the universe. The difficulty with the materialist is, he can think only in terms of bulk.

Personality Created, not Evolved

In the book to which we have just referred, Dr. Brightman says (p. 157): "The absolutely unconscious cannot be the metaphysical cause of the conscious." Then he quotes from John Locke: "Incognitive being cannot produce a cognitive. . . . It is as impossible to conceive that ever bare incognitive matter should produce a thinking, intelligent being as that nothing should of itself produce matter." Hence the only sensible and rational conclusion is that only an Infinite Personality could create finite personalities. Every effect must have an adequate cause.

Is God Limited or Infinite?

As the reader will note, we have been considerably stirred up over Dr. Brightman's book, *The Problem of God*. He gives the following definition of God: "God is a person supremely conscious, supremely valuable and supremely creative, yet limited by the free choice of other persons and by restrictions in His own nature." The first part of this definition is quite acceptable to the evangelical believer; but the second part is not. God is not limited in the ways here described. Being infinitely wise and powerful, He is able to create free personalities, and then restrain His power in order to give such persons an opportunity to exercise their freedom within the divinely prescribed limits. Being omnipotent, He is capable of omnipotent self-control. No; free finite beings impose no limitation on God. They are an additional proof of His infinity and omnipotence.

Are There "Restrictions" in God's own Nature?

We hold that this conception will not stand the test of reason. Since God is eternal and uncreated, as Dr. Brightman himself holds, He must be unlimited, by that very token. The eternal cannot be limited. What would there be to limit the eternal? If God were limited, there would be something greater than He, and then He would not be God. If He were limited, He would be dependent on something else, and thus that something that is eternal and self-existent would be God. If God is infinite in duration, He must be infinite in every way, for a being could not be infinite in one way and limited in other ways. Similarly a being that is finite in one way, must be finite in all ways. The finite begins when finite creatures are brought into existence. Time begins when the Eternal Being creates temporal subsistences. The eternal and the infinite include the temporal and spacial. Therefore the Infinite Being can sustain a relation to the finite; the Absolute Being can sustain a relation to the relative. The finite must be dependent on the Infinite.

Discounting the Bible

Another objection must be registered against Dr. Brightman. At a number of places in his book he casts uncalled-for reflections on Biblical teaching. His method is rather indirect than the direct. For example, among "primitive" ideas to be rejected, he girds in this way at the Bible: "As recently as 850 B. C. the writer known as J, or the Jahvist, described God as walking in the Garden in the cool of the day," etc. Here is a slavish following of the documentary hypothesis, which has so often been discredited by competent scholars. But what about the saying in Genesis? Perhaps the best translation is: "And they heard the sound of Jehovah walking in the wind of the day." And what does this mean? It is not something superficial and "primitive." No! no! It has a very deep metaphysical basis and background. It means that the Infinite Being, by the very fact of His infinitude, is able to relate Himself to time and space; therefore, since He is able to function differently in different circumstances, there must be a real movement of God in space —a real coming and going. Essentially He is present everywhere, but functionally He is different in different places. When He came to Adam and Eve in the Edenic Garden, it was to function there in such way as to make them conscious of His presence. Perhaps if we would plow a little deeper, we would find that the Bible is always right, after all.

No Darkness for God

There are spots on the sun, but there are no spots in the knowledge of God. Says the Psalmist: "If I say, Surely darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee" (Ps. 139:11, 12). No wonder the Psalmist exclaimed: "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it."

No Getting Rid of Purpose

We find a relevant paragraph in Alfred North Whitehead's book, *The Function of*

Reason (p. 12): "Many a scientist has patiently designed experiments for the *purpose* of substantiating his belief that animal operations are motivated by *no* purpose. He has perhaps spent his spare time in writing articles to prove that human beings are as other animals, so that 'purpose' is a category irrelevant for the explanation of their bodily activities, his own included. Scientists animated by the *purpose* of proving that they are *purposeless* constitute an interesting subject for study." Italics ours. To put it more simply, the mechanistic scientist's *purpose* is to prove that he has *no purpose!*

A Thought for Theists and Atheists

A profound article by Professor Cornelius Van Til, D.D., of Westminster Theological Seminary, appears in the December number of *Christianity Today.* He says: "If God is absolute personality, He is completely self-conscious. God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. There are no hidden depths of possibility within or beyond Him. He knoweth the end from the beginning. It is this absolute self-consciousness of God that forms the basis of certainty for our knowledge. If it were so also for God, the whole of our coherent experience would be adrift on a shoreless, bottomless void. Our thought would be operating in a vacuum. If there is to be rationality or coherence anywhere, there must be absolute rationality somewhere. Our rationality rests upon God's rationality."

The Need of Ultimate Rationality

We wish that unbelievers, especially those of the atheistic group, would ponder Dr. Van Til's profound statements as given in the preceding paragraph. The unbeliever claims to be guided by reason. If he worships at any shrine, it is at the shrine of Reason (with a capital R). But think it through: If there is no rationality as the ultimate basis and source of the universe, then the universe is not rational. Then whence comes the reasoning power of the atheist? He is a part of the universe; so, if the universe is non-rational, he must also be non-rational. So all the professed reasoning of the atheist is only a blank and a vacuum. But note, further: if there is an ultimate rationality, that fact implies a person, for there can be no rationality without self-consciousness, and self-consciousness means personality. So if we reason correctly, we are led back to God, the Ultimate Personality. This conception gives the heart much comfort and stability, for even when bitter experiences come to us, we may still know that there is back of and in it all a deep reason that we can trust even when we cannot fully understand.

The Word and the Holy Spirit

How do we know that the Word of God *is* the Word of God. Because the Holy Spirit bears witness in our hearts to the veracity of the Bible. This is well depicted in the Westminster Confession, which says (I:v): "Although we may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to a high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scriptures, and the heavenliness of the matter, and the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole . . . Yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward working of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." Here is set forth the true relation of the Word and the Spirit. Here is also the only sure pathway to certainty. This doctrine saves men, on the one hand, from false mysticism, illuminism and immediacy, and, on the other hand, from the futility of rationalism.

A Witness for Theism

We are no admirer of Bruce Barton and his distortions and glosses of Biblical Christianity; but his testimony to theism at this particular time is apropos: "To my finite mind, God is inconceivable, but a universe which just happened is *more* inconceivable. A Divine Intelligence is beyond my meager comprehension, and as for a divine plan, I do not see what it is; but I know that men and women are intelligent, and to believe that an unintelligent universe has produced something greater than itself . . . this to me is an absurdity." Of course, if his knowledge of God is as meager as he represents it to be, we do not wonder that he is a Modernist in religion; but his argument against atheism is sound. Non-intelligence could never, never in all eternity, give rise to intelligence, because no cause can produce an effect that is greater than itself.

St. Luke and John the Baptist

We are now studying the gospel according to St. Luke in the International Series of Sunday School lessons. Have our readers noticed that St. Luke is the only evangelist who gives an account of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist? Matthew and John give some account of his public ministry, but say nothing of the angel's announcement to Zacharias that his

wife Elizabeth should conceive and bear a son in their old age. Thus the conception of John the Baptist was a miracle, just as was the conception of Isaac. So it seems that more than one "biological miracle" occurred in Bible times. How else could God's plan of redemption have been carried out? Nowhere in the New Testament except in Luke's gospel is there any account of, or even reference to, the miraculous conception of John the Baptist. Does that mean that Luke's narrative of this event must be thrown into the discard? The virgin birth of Christ is depicted in two of the gospels, those of Matthew and Luke, and is implied in several other places in the New Testament. If an incident is recorded once in the Bible, that is enough to stamp it as true; for the Bible is a veracious book throughout.

The World a Neighborhood

It is often said today that the advancement of science has made the whole world a neighborhood, and has practically cancelled distances. The saying, of course, is true. However, an incisive writer in one of our contemporaries has this to say on the subject: "The mere fact that the world is now a neighborhood does not satisfy. We must be assured as to the kind of a neighborhood it is going to be before we can rest in peace and safety. A world neighborhood has become a very dangerous place, as all now admit. . . A world neighborhood must be converted into a brotherhood of the right kind in order to make it safe." We suggest that the world try the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is a rule of universal love, good will and equity, as the sovereign remedy for the ills of mankind.

Colleges "on the Carpet"

A recent editorial bears this title. There can be no doubt that colleges and universities are now being called to account. The said editor says the following regarding far too many academic institutions: "Religion is largely taboo or combatted, even laughed at. The wisdom of this world is very apt to get more foolish than anything else we know. It is doubtless true, as many complain, that boys and girls from the best Christian homes have their religious inheritance destroyed. That is not the fault of the youth, but of the men and women who give tone and atmosphere to the college. We believe the Saviour's warning about putting a stumbling-block in the way of the young and inexperienced may apply to them." Wise and needed admonitions are these.

Has Man Control of Nature?

We confess that we had a good deal of liking for Dr. Robert A. Millikan, even though he does believe in evolution. He has often said good things about religion and man's need of it. But we do not like some things he said recently in an address in New York before the Phi Beta Kappa societies. He asserted that science has displaced the old idea that man is at the mercy of a Supreme Being, because he (man) has gained a considerable control of nature. Man *has* gained some measure of control over nature, it is true; but it certainly is very limited. Read the account of the many natural casualties that are reported in the daily newspapers. How much control has man over the weather, over cyclones, over blizzards, over earthquakes, over volcanic eruptions, over the sun, moon and stars? Practically none. In recent years there have been many of these natural calamities that the whole world of mankind cannot check and control. For our part, we would rather be at the "mercy of God" than at the mercy of a natural world that is not controlled by a Supreme Power and Intelligence. For even if natural forces may sometimes destroy men's bodies, a good and an all-wise God will take care of their essential nature, namely, their self-conscious souls. Of all things, may the good Lord deliver us from a ruthless, unguided mechanistic universe!

Tables Turned on the Scientist

Some unregenerated scientist sniffs at the idea of man being "the plaything of God," as he puts it. We do not know of any person in the whole world who holds such an idea. Surely the God of the Bible who so loved the world as to make an infinite sacrifice to save it could not be so regarded. Why, He "loves us with an everlasting love." Does that fit into the conception of this scoffing scientist? Still, one of our fellow-editors turns the tables on the scientist in a somewhat pert way. He says: "As a phrase, we rather like that 'plaything of God.' It suggests God's love for us; for how a child loves his toys! It suggests continual use, taking toys to bed, and wanting them the first thing in the morning." This is good repartee, and rather outwits the scoffer. Still, we are not God's "playthings," according to the Bible. We are God's children, and He tenderly cares for us and puts His good Spirit into our hearts.

Where Materialism Falls Short

In the book just from the press of Richard R. Smith, Inc., Rabbi Silver's *Religion in a Changing World* (reviewed elsewhere in this number), we find the following golden words, which we most heartily endorse, however we may question other things that he says: "When materialism, which is not science but only an interpretation of science, will trace for man the successive stages by which insensate units of energy combine themselves through motion and organization into the patterns of Aristotle's or Plato's mind; when it will demonstrate by what unbroken process of continuity lifeless and mindless clay evolves into a being, thinking, aspiring man, and how a universe devoid of personality and will can give rise to personality and will in man, then there will be time enough to consider the relinquishment of a spiritual interpretation of life." Here, surely, the inadequacy of materialism to account for the greatest and finest values of human existence is again exposed.

How Religion has Anticipated Science

"Religion has frequently anticipated science," says the incisive author above quoted. We condense somewhat his further statements. An eminent American scientist recently declared that science has made two momentous contributions to human thought—the unexpected orderliness of the universe and the vital role which man can play in it. But ages ago religion declared that the universe is cosmos not chaos: "The Lord hath in wisdom founded the earth; He hath established the heavens in understanding" (Prov. 3:19). "Ages ago religion declared that man was not mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life, but a co-worker of God, a co-creator—'a little lower than the angels'" (Ps. 8:5). Well may we add to what Rabbi Silver has said that in the very creation of man, according to the Bible, God gave him dominion over the realm of nature, and thus made known to him "the vital role" which he was to play.

Seven Canons which Higher Criticism Must Ultimately Face

By Professor H. W. Magoun, Ph.D.

VII

No canon can be accepted as sound, unless it is possible to get results that tally with known facts, when the said canon is applied to modern writings that exhibit the characteristics shown by those for which it was originally intended.

THE essential thing about any theory is the practical test: Does it work? If it does not, it is valueless. It may be enticing, and it may seem to work; but even so it may break down completely when the right kind of a test is made. A man once bought a fine-looking pair of boots. He was pleased with their appearance; but the uppers soon began to part company with the soles. He took them to the dealer for an explanation. He got it: "Och Himmel! Did you valk in dose poots? Dose vasn't valkin' poots: dose vas cavalry poots!"

The dealer had his money and the customer had a new experience. The boots looked well; but the practical test disclosed their fundamental weakness. They went to pieces. That is precisely what has happened to the theory of higher criticism. It was regarded as a "beautiful theory;" but it could not stand a genuine practical test. It seemed to work well—with the help of the Redactor family—up to a certain point. Then it began to fall apart.

Two intensely practical tests were devised for its benefit, and each showed how utterly inadequate it was as an explanation of the Pentateuchal difficulties laid bare by scholars. The first was made by a prominent British educator, Dr. Henry Hayman, who had long studied the Homeric question and had done valiant work in Homer's defense. He took the canons of criticism and applied them to Burn's *Ode to a Mountain Daisy,* the details of whose composition were well known. The canons yielded two authors and a redactor.

The second test was the work of a canny Scot. He wrote a book, including an original poem in Greek, which he analyzed in the most approved fashion employed by critics of Homer. The title of the book was, *Homeric Games at an Ancient St. Andrews,* and its author was Alexander Shewan. The book was reviewed in *The Classical Weekly* for January

20, 1912, pp. 93 f., by Professor John A. Scott, who had himself done admirable work in the Homeric field. The whole is an extremely learned and tremendously telling caricature of modern Homeric criticism, which undertook to apply higher critical methods to the Iliad and Odyssey and thus reduce them to mere examples of ancient "parasitic literature." The attempt failed ignominiously, and the higher criticism of Homer is dead and buried. I attended the obsequies myself. They were private!

Purporting to publish a fairly complete fragment of an early epic poem hitherto unknown, Shewan's book is about as effective a bit of polemics as was ever produced. The fragment contains 317 verses, some of which are plainly late interpolations, and its title is the *Amazonophosilomachia!* There is also a second fragment of about 250 verses. Both are referred to a lost work of Arctinus, the *Aethiopis.* There is said to be a superscription on the papyrus, according to which it is a copy of the *Alexad* of Arctinus of Miletus, and this is therefore said to be a subdivision of the larger work, the *Aethiopis.*

A six-page Scholium accompanies the work, and this, in turn, is held to be remarkable in that it contains a long and unknown fragment from Hippocrates and other new material. Two more fragments follow belonging to the Hesiodic school, since one of them is directed to Perses, the brother of Hesiod (if he ever had such a brother!). These verses are assigned to Hesiod's *Works and Days!* An elegiac distich follows, having reference to some athletic contest and a bit of inscribed iron resembling the head of a golf-club is then reproduced. The iron is said to be Minoan in origin.

There are lavish critical notes, long *Prolegomena,* numerous illustrations, and a translation. In this it is made to appear that Helen of Troy came to St. Andrews with Paris, saw a cricket-match, went to Aberdeen, and was there honored and jeered. A long list of words which appear in no other Greek author is involved, and it requires unusual skill to determine their exact relationship to other words in the matter of their signification. They are exploited in a learned manner, as becomes the discoverer of a new text!

The rules of higher criticism are laid down in the *Prolegomena,* and four great expansions of the poem are thus brought to light. One (D) had reference to food and feasts, another (S) dealt with games, another (DT) with the toilet, etc., still another (J) put in jokes, and, finally, some poet of the Hesiodic school worked the material over and expurgated it. The kernel left amounts to about one-sixth of the whole.

To round out his work, Shewan juggles with the numbers. The poem has 567 lines, it is a number that can be divided by 7, the quotient is 81, or 3 times 3 times 3 times 3, etc. The name Carnegie is connected with a title of Apollo, *Karneios,* "the horned-one," hence conucopia, and Andrew becomes a nature myth. With great erudition other such meanings are derived, and the whole absurdity of many learned conclusions is potently and graphically suggested, without any charges being brought against them directly.

When the exposure is once made and it is realized that Mr. Shewan himself wrote the excellent Greek verses, attributed to many men of many ages, his bold assault on the very citadel of the critics excites the wonder and admiration of the reader, and he begins to understand how those new Greek words came into existence. Mr. Shewan certainly was a master of Homeric Greek to be able to compose so many lines in the Homeric style, to say nothing of the late "interpolations."

It is only natural, when once the superficiality of the critical methods is comprehended, to ask how and why scholars go off on such tangents. The answer is really simple enough. A higher critic is usually by nature a brilliant man, and his brilliancy is his undoing. Such mentalities tend inevitably toward intensity along one line—they have what Woodrow Wilson called "one-track minds"—and that leads directly to shallowness in their thinking. They do not turn a thing over to look at its other side before making up their minds. As a result, they are able to accept a mass of possibilities and probabilities—omitting a second mass that may be much more likely—as proof of some hypothesis, and they then proceed with their own speculations. These may be subjective conjectures, with no solid foundation in fact; but they are apt to regard them as "established results of scholarship," and any one who ventures to differ with them is not a "responsible scholar." He may be duly grateful that he is not—for that sort of thing!

It is this single-mindedness—simple-mindedness might almost be used—which accounts for higher criticism. It is the tap-root of both higher criticism and the new theology, which

is hardly theology at all in the last analysis, because it is so thoroughly anthropomorphic in its inception and conclusions. Curious things result. The critics will split a verse to support their theory! And they will not recognize the possibility of a scribal "gloss."

As the basic principles ("the canons of criticism") are the same in both cases, to all intents and purposes, the collapse of the higher criticism of Homer carries with it the collapse of the higher criticism of the Old Testament; for the two must stand or fall together, the foundations being essentially the same in both instances. If the process is proved to be false and chimerical in Homer's case, it must be false and chimerical in that of the Old Testament; for no process can be both false and true when employed on similar material. If the material is not similar but has marked differences, there is a possibility that it may be true in one case but not in another; and yet even then caution is necessary lest false conclusions be reached.

That no such dissimilarity exists in the documents involved is so clear that attention need only be called to the fact that each deals with the most exalted subject in the literature of the people to whom the documents belong, that each is the most sacred writing in their possession, and that each served for many ages as a means of educating the youth in the things regarded as proper and right. Each has an antithetical form of diction, each was adapted for memorizing and was memorized by the male portion of the community set apart to be educated, and each has had a prominent place in the literature of the world. In fact, an epic poem comes nearer to the Old Testament in its literary form than any other type of human composition. Concerning this there should be no room for dispute.

For that reason the admissions of Andrew Lang, the great critic, are of especial interest. He regretted the necessity of doing so but did admit fully and freely that this generally-accepted pet theory of the philological world, concerning Homer, had departed this life never to be resuscitated. When the facts were fully known, the theory collapsed utterly. It had seemed so plausible that Professor Gildersleeve of the Johns Hopkins University was almost the only Classical scholar who did not accept it, and he felt so lonesome in his stand that he confessedly tried not to tell his students what he thought of it. His conclusions about the matter are now so fully justified that lonesome indeed must be the man who ventures to entertain any respect for Wolf's once popular hypothesis. Interest in it disappeared years ago, soon after the newspapers exploited the admissions of Andrew Lang. They were regarded as final.

Even more damaging to the critical theory was the work of Dr. Hayman. All the circumstances attending the composition of Burn's ode were known, even including its date. He was plowing one day in April, 1786, and happened to notice that he had turned under a flower. The result was his ode:

TO A MOUNTAIN DAISY

Wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower,
Thou's met me in an evil hour;
For I maun crush amang the stoure
Thy tender stem:
To spare thee now is past my power,
Thou bonny gem.

Alas! it's no thy neibor sweet,
The bonny lark, companion meet,
Bending thee 'mang the dewey weet,
Wi' speckled breast,
When upward springing, blithe, to greet
The purpling east.

Cauld blew the bitter biting north
Upon thy early, humble birth;
Yet cheerfully thou glinted forth
Amid the storm,
Scarce reared above the parent earth
Thy tender form.

The flaunting flowers our gardens yield,
High sheltering woods and wa's maun shield;
But thou beneath the random bield
O'clod or stane
Adorns the histie stibble-field,
Unseen, alane.

There, in thy scanty mantle clad,
Thy snawie bosom sunward spread,
Thou lifts thy unassuming head
In humble guise;
But now the share uptears thy bed,
And low thou lies!

In these five stanzas, here and there, Scottish words appear, indicating a Scottish author. There are also peculiar forms of expression, to which Dr. Hayman called attention, especially the use of the third person singular of the verb for the second,—"Thou's met" (has met), "Thou . . . adorns," "Thou glinted forth," "Thou lifts," and "Thou lies." In the four stanzas that remain, the diction is with a single exception pure English. The exception is in the last line of the first of the four. They are as follows:

Such is the fate of artless maid,
Sweet floweret of the rural shade!
By love's simplicity betrayed,
And guileless trust,
Till she, like thee, all soiled, is laid
Low i' the dust.

Such is the fate of simple bard,
On life's rough ocean luckless starred!
Unskilful he to note the card
Of prudent lore,
Till billows rage, and gales blow hard,
And whelm him o'er.

Such fate to suffering worth is given,
Who long with wants and woes has striven,

By human pride or cunning driven
To misery's brink,
Till wrenched of every stay but Heaven,
He, ruined, sink!

Even thou who mourn'st the daisy's fate,
That fate is thine,—no distant date:
Stern Ruin's ploughshare drives, elate,
Full on thy bloom,
Till crushed beneath the furrow's weight,
Shall by thy doom!

A comparison of these stanzas with those that precede will show how different the two divisions of the poem are. Dr. Hayman says that they are much more divergent than some things in the Old Testament, where, on account of the differences found, different authors have been postulated. As an example he cites the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32, which critics have assigned to a poet of Northern Israel. The direct testimony that "Moses spake in the ears of all the assembly of Israel the words of this song" (Gen. 31:30) counts for nothing in the eyes of the critics. The theory is all that does count!

That theory, applied to the above poem, its own canons being used in the application, "proved," if it proves anything, that it took three men to produce the said poem, the first being a Scotchman, the second an Englishman, and the third a late descendant of the versatile Redactor family. Just how much the last gentleman had to do with the poem besides joining its parts was not clear; but his hand appeared to be betrayed in the final stanza, where a change of diction was in evidence. All this Dr. Hayman exploited in genuine critical fashion.

He called attention to the different vocabulary used in the two parts of the poem, citing such words as *stoure, weet,* and *bield,* also to the modified words in the first part, such as *amang, stane,* and *snawie,* to the combination of the two things in *histie stibble-field,* and then went on to show how different the thoughts were that appeared in the two sections. "Physical objectivity," he says, characterizes the first part, while "moral subjectivity and sentimental reflection" characterize the second, and he emphasizes his point by asking who does not see these things. He suggests that "The northern dialect claims the physical realm as its own, and the southern the ethical." He also suggests that the "latter exhibits in every stanza a new image of pathetic sadness."

He exploits the "similar formulaic recurrence in the fifth line of every stanza" of the second part, quoting the "*Till* she, like Thee," etc., to give added force to the statement. "This love of formulaic iterancy is wholly absent from" the first part, he says, and he goes on to contrast the "syle" of the two. With great ingenuity he then parodies the fanciful analyses which critics apply to the verbal structure of literary productions, contrasting "maid" with "Sweet floweret of," etc., doing a similar thing for each of the stanzas that follow. Moreover, he imitates the critics in yet another way, suggesting that "Suffering worth" is reminiscent of Shakespeare's "patient merit."

A trace of Gray's *Elegy* is found in the final stanza, he says, where either the English gentleman or the compiler makes use of an "apostrophe to himself," forgetting that the " 'thee' of the preceding stanza is the daisy." He sums up the differences of the two sections, which he attributes to B^1 and B^2, the redactor being designated as C, and then goes on to show, by way of good measure, that B^1 could moralize, since another poem "To a Mouse," whose nest had been stirred up by the same ploughshare, did its moralizing in the same northern dialect. He quotes the fifth, sixth, and seventh stanzas, in the last of which appear the well-known lines,—

The best-laid schemes o' mice and men
Gang aft a-gley,
And lea'e us nought but grief and pain
For promised joy.

He adds one more, from the last stanza, "Still thou art blest, compar'd wi' me!" The rest has reference to the poet's power to see evils that are past and to dread those that are to come.

In stating the reasons for reaching his critical conclusions, he quotes the exact words of Professor S. R. Driver as applied to Genesis, saying that "Where the phrases of so distinguished an authority were so apposite to the purpose, it would have been a mere affectation of originality to invent new ones." He sums up the matter in these words, attributed to some possible readers, "If the method of the higher criticism is trustworthy, then the above Ode must be by more than one author." He ends with these words: "Any who have got thus far will be able to judge for themselves, whether this consequent is to be admitted or denied, and to clinch the argument accordingly." (*Bib. Sac.,* LV., 557-561.)

The whole thing up to the final denouement, is done with such seriousness, such exact duplication of the critical methods, and such apparent good faith, that if the ode had been a bit of ancient lore, the source of which was unknown, his treatment of it would have been hailed by higher critics as an able and success-

ful application of their canons to the elucidation of the genesis of the ode, and to a correct understanding of its true nature. Unfortunately, for them, it is modern, its entire history is known, its author is famous, and there is no possible way of escaping from the *cul-de-sac,* into which Dr. Haymon has driven them. The critical methods are thus shown to be artificial, unreliable, pretentious, unscientific, arrogant, irrevelant, and irreverent.

That this indictment is not too severe is made evident by certain other matters already referred to in connection with the first canon. Years ago, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* three articles were published under the title, "A Layman's View of the Critical Theory." They were a bit unusual because of the knowledge they betrayed of widely different things. One was farming. (A back-yard war garden and summers on a farm explain that.) Another was business. (Experience in a life-insurance office, in settling an estate, etc., explains that.) Still another was optometry. (Familiarity with optics such that a successful pair of bifocal lenses was designed after professionals had failed several different times, because they failed to observe that conflicting lense axes produce a prismatic effect, explains that.) Yet another was a familiarity with psychology. (A study of and a life-long interest in such things explain that.) Some heterodox poetic views on prosody was another. (The solution, in that field, of a riddle which had baffled scholars for about twenty centuries, explains that, the solution being the result of a somewhat unusual combination of dogged persistency, intensive studies in musical rhythm, and extensive linguistic experience.) An inclination to employ legal forms of diction was still another. (Its convenience and a logical mind explain that.)

There were some minor items; but these are enough for the purpose in hand. Knowing nothing of these divergent experiences and being unable to exploit such things themselves, critical gentlemen would naturally decide, *ex cathedra,* that no college professor who wrote such articles could have any knowledge of mundane affairs so remote and that, therefore, six or seven other gentlemen must either have helped him or tampered with his manuscript. They would then infer that he could not have been the author of the finished product but must have written only the original outline of the articles, the second, however, being really the work of a Sanskrit scholar. (Well, he got his Ph.D. in Sanskrit!)

In one of his manuscripts, this same author has a sentence of some 747 words and, in a published book, ten sentences in a paragraph of 75 words, seven in one of 67 words, and twelve in one of 108 words. Critical ideas would deny the possibility that the unconscionably long sentence could have originated in the same brain as the short ones. It did, however, in this way. An attempt was made to marshall a lot of facts in the shortest possible space and in the form of the strongest possible phalanx. Nothing else was thought of, and the whole took shape without effort. Verily, the critical mind hath much to learn, if it ever is to become a reliable guide to searchers after truth!

Some time after the above pages were written, still another highly instructive and decidedly damaging article was found in the *Classical Weekly* for November 17, 1930. Its title was *Homer and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle,* and its author was Professor Samuel E. Bassett of the University of Vermont, an able Homeric scholar and a keen student of the Classics.

Homer, like most writers of fiction, based his poem on realities; but, also like them, he failed to keep in mind all the minute details of his story, and, as a result, he manages to disagree with himself, if he does not actually contradict himself. Such items, very naturally, furnish material for critical acumen in exploiting Wolf's theory of various rhapsodists out of whose work the Homeric poems were ultimately fashioned. These inconsistencies enabled the critics to fabricate an extremely plausible case, so plausible, in fact, that practically all Homeric scholars but Gildersleeve either accepted it or were much inclined to do so. His "uncanny accuracy" of judgment led him to dissent; but he actually tried, so he told me himself, not to let his own views be known. To be absolutely fair, he gave us the theory in full, merely saying, "but I don't see why" such and such a thing "may not be true." We didn't either!

Now, these inconsistencies Professor Bassett has martialed in fairly full array and over against them he has placed precisely similar inconsistencies in a story by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, which was published posthumously. That appears to indicate that it was never revised by the author. But—they must have escaped the notice of the copy reader and also of the (probably, since that is the common practice) three readers who passed on the book

before it was published, although that formality may have been omitted in this case.

They were also overlooked by a keen critical editor, who read the book for the story alone. They never would have escaped him, had he received the manuscript for publication. As he did not and was in search of reading matter to take his mind off his work, he simply missed the conflicting forms of statement and was surprised when attention was called to them.

The story in question is entitled *The End of Devil Hawker,* certainly a suggestive title! Its value in this connection is the remarkably close parallelisms which Professor Bassett has so admirably exploited. If a mind as keen as that of Sir Arthur could be guilty of such slips in our own times, why can any one, critics included, expect any more exact results from a blind poet in the remote days of the Trojan War or its subsequent periods?

The simple truth is that Homer was human, not a super-man, though a wonderful poet, a poet so remarkable that he fits his rhythm to the content of his words in a fashion that has completely baffled the metricians and led them into all sorts of absurdities concerning his lines. "Not metrical," they say. Yes; but splendidly rhythmical and eminently fitting in the skill wherewith they express the thought in a movement that is appropriate to it and therefore amazingly consistent. Homer was an artist, not a slave to metrical form.

This paper of Professor Bassett's is one more valuable contribution to the material which all critics must some day reckon with; for it supplies a modern instance in which one of the keenest of authors has been guilty of almost exactly the same sort of lapses on account of which Homer has been denied the authorship of his immortal poems. Was this story by Conan Doyle a late product of the versatile Redactor family, or did he write it himself? What say the critics? We all want to know!

Belmont, Massachusetts.

Can Evolution be Theistic?

DUDLEY JOSEPH WHITNEY, B.S.

AN occasional scientist of standing is an atheist; many more are agnostics; but without much question the majority are theists of a kind. If they are not Christian theists, they are, at least, believers in some kind of a Deity.

Belief among educated men and women therefore runs in two very distinct lines: They believe in a Deity, that is, they are theists; and they also believe in evolution.

Now put these two things together: theism and evolution. The individual is in the position of believing what has been termed theistic evolution, or else believing in a Deity so divorced from the material universe that evolution in the material universe runs itself.

As to the atheists and agnostics, they are doubtless consistent in believing in out-and-out evolution—that is, in evolution that operates without any Deity. The theist, however, is in a different position. He must determine whether he is going to have that Deity divorced entirely from matter, or in some way controlling matter.

Assuming the latter (which is almost a necessity if one is consistent in being a theist), one becomes in the nature of things a theistic evolutionist, and the obligation then develops to determine what one believes when one accepts theistic evolution. What relation has the Deity to evolution? What is theistic evolution? Can genuine evolution really be theistic? Where do the natural and the supernatural begin? Or is there any difference between them? All these are vital questions.

The atheists, for example, have been arguing that evolution implies atheism. If they are correct in this contention, scholars must either drop evolution or drop theism, and the Christian and other historic religions must vanish or hold to a falsehood. There can be no other result.

Because a belief in both evolution and some sort of a God is so common in educated circles does not make that belief right, nor does it make an examination of the problem useless.

In fact, my thesis is that there is no such thing as theistic evolution. Instead, one of two conditions exists: if genuine evolution rules in the material universe, there is no God, or only such a vague, impersonal, inoperative kind of a God that He can be ignored for all intents and purposes. On the other hand, if definite theistic control of matter is needed to make evolution work, the process is not truly evolu-

tion, but a species of special creation, and the theistic evolutionist in this case is twin to the Fundamentalist as far as the philosophy of the problem of creation is concerned. The only difference between the two would be regarding what events transpired, not regarding the principles underlying nature.

Putting the thesis a little more concisely, I assert that there is, or has been, no such thing as theistic evolution and that the logical thinker must be either atheist or special creationist. If he is a real evolutionist, he must be an atheist; if a real theist, he must be a creationist.

In order to analyze the problem, it is first necessary to determine what is meant by evolution. Evolution has been called simply change; it has been called orderly change; it has been given various other definitions; but in the ultimate analysis, processes in evolution prove to be *natural* as distinguished from *supernatural.*

For example, in assuming the evolution of the solar system by the planetesimal hypothesis, astronomers assume that a passing star caused matter to issue from the sun in some way, and the force of gravity and various other forces working on that matter caused the planets to result. Thus physical laws only are allowed in the planetesimal hypothesis. No place is given to "miracle," or processes transcending physical laws such as have been, or well may be, determined.

So also in the evolution of the earth, geologists in the name of science adopt the principle of uniformity; of earth processes such as occur now, sometimes far more active than at present, it may be, but in nature the same. The processes assumed in earth evolution are *natural,* not *supernatural.*

So also in organic evolution; as worked out in theory by Darwin, the processes assumed are so natural that the theory is called Natural Selection. Change of species in this theory is assumed to have developed, through the survival of the fittest, not by any exercise of divine power on organisms. The theory is that variation occurs in all living things and that individuals whose form and functions are an improvement over normal form and functions survive better than other individuals in the struggle for existence, and so in time new forms and functions are brought about; non-vetebrates changing into vertebrates, fishes into amphibians, and amphibians by degrees into horses, dogs and men. The process assumed is definitely *naturalistic.* This is true whether orthodox Darwinism is adopted, or whether, in combination with other supposed agencies, the term Natural Selection is still applied, provided the process is really evolution.

The question therefore confronts us whether such evolution can be theistic or not: whether we do not have to reject such evolution if we are really consistent theists. I maintain that one or the other must be done by the logical, consistent thinker.

Leaving abstractions aside, the question can best be decided by taking some definite problems in evolution. Take, for example, the step between the non-human primate and man, or between fish and amphibian, or tree shrew and bat. Evolutionists are uncertain as to the nature of the nearest non-human ancestor of man. Some say that such ancestor was an ape much like the chimpanzee; others that the nature of the ancestor is unknown, but that he was a primate of some kind.

Be that as it may, and granting some such ancestry, two processes are possible: one the strict, naturalistic kind of evolution; the other what is currently termed theistic evolution.

In the first case, if the change came by natural selection of the kind suggested by Darwin, perhaps with some aid from the inheritance of acquired characters, and germ disturbance of any kind, material variations between parents and offspring would develop, strictly through natural causes, and the necessary variations in the right direction would accumulate and be inherited, so that in time *homo* would be born. Unless in some vague, and for all practical purposes inoperative way, there is no theistic evolution in that — it is all strictly *natural.*

In the other case it may be assumed that normal, natural occuring variations would not be sufficient to cause man to descend from monkey, or whatever the primate ancestor was, except through the special direction of the Deity. The Deity under such conditions would cause special variations toward man, perhaps even cause lemur, or monkey, or ape, to give birth to a pair of true human babies! That would be very *unnatural,* and it might be called theistic evolution, but would it be evolution? A Fundamentalist myself, I can imagine the Fundamentalists hugging themselves with glee to find evolutionists asserting that kind of evolution.

Why, as far as the principle of the thing is concerned, there is not a particle of difference between causing an ape pair to give birth to a human child, and forming an adult man from

clay, or making five loaves and two fishes provide food for a multitude, or causing leprous flesh to become clean and whole in an instant. *When one adopts one kind of theism in the problem of creation, he may as well adopt another.* Otherwise he is compelled to have his Deity divorced from the material universe, so that the universe will go its own way and evolution work itself. With the kind of a Deity that causes evolution to work itself, evolution is true evolution, but it is not *theistic* evolution.

On the other hand, if evolution will not work without special help from the Deity, it is not really evolution, but special creation. We may imagine the possibility of a Deity causing a human child to be born from monkey parents, but we cannot call such a process genuine evolution. Possibly our tastes would cause us to prefer the origin of an adult man by direct, special creation. Logically the "theistic evolutionist" could have no objection in the philosophy of science to the latter processes.

Instead of studying the origin of man, we might take the shrew-bat step. In strict evolution natural variation alone among tree shrews would have to bring about the change of legs and skin into the wings of bats. True theistic evolution would mean that alterations were made in the form of shrew offspring by theistic impulse, so that they were not shrews but bats, the change occurring, perhaps in a single generation, perhaps through many. Such a process might be theistic, I will grant, but it would be an error to call it evolution.

A similar form of analysis might be used in the step from fish to amphibian, or from worm to insect, or fern to conifer, but one example will suffice for all. The heart of the problem rests in the question whether such changes—if they occurred—came through natural variations and strictly natural processes (true evolution), or whether they developed by the special intervention of divine power. If one takes the first position, I maintain that, by using natural processes only, he assumes a kind of evolution which is in its nature non-theistic and he has therefore a universe without a Deity; but, on the other hand, if he adopts the "theistic" kind of evolution, he has a process which is in its nature miraculous and essentially the same as the process assumed by the special creationist. Such process is not evolution at all. A man therefore must have evolution without a Deity, or a process which is not really evolution.

Whenever the evolutionists find themselves compelled to agree that "miracle" was needed in turning primitive primate into man, or shrew into bat, or worm into insect, that minute they surrender to the creationist. Personally, I would rejoice to see them face the issue, and once it was faced, I would expect to see honest, clear-thinking scientists discard evolution and adopt creation as a belief.

Besides the two possibilities discussed in detail above, there is a third possibility—if it is possible.

In this the assumption might be made that natural law is universal and eternal: the effects of light, heat, electricity, gravity, and other forms of energy being always the same under similar conditions, but that in some vague manner the spirit of an all-pervading "First Cause" dominates it all, so that evolution could be strictly natural and yet theistic.

Before such a concept I confess my helplessness; it is beyond me. It is too much like having one's loaf and eating it too; having a Deity without having one. Such a Deity would at least be so vague and impersonal that He, or It, would be only an abstraction. I set the concept aside, until some defender of theistic evolution undertakes to explain it in terms that my mind can grasp.

In considering the problem of true evolution versus some kind of theistic evolution, or direct creation, a prime essential is to know what occurred in the evolution that is alleged. Did fish change to amphibian by strict natural selection through many years and many generations, or in one, or two, or a few great mutations? Did primitive primate change to man in the first way or the second? Did shrew change to bat suddenly or slowly? In all cases, what caused the changes, strict natural evolution, or what? What was the nature of the changes?

Every one, I believe, will agree that a decision on these points is essential before one can be a consistent evolutionist, or discuss the problem of evolution and theism intelligently. A careful analysis of the above thesis by some scientist who is both evolutionist and theist ought to enable us to view the problem more clearly than it has yet been viewed.

Exeter, California.

* * *

Perverted truth is the devil's mightiest weapon.—*Southern Methodist.*

* * *

The argument for the Risen Christ is the living Christian.—*Winifrid Kirkland.*

The Reaction to Faith

ONCE again the *Watchman Examiner* in their issue of December 11, 1930, have presented facts that the whole Christian world should give attention to. They are superlatively important. However, in attending to them we should have in mind also another striking and opposite development of our times; namely, the powerful current toward faith among physicists and astronomers.

Sir James Jeans, astronomer of England, who early suggested the new tidal theory (displacing the Nebular Hypothesis of Laplace) of the origin of the solar system;

Sir Arthur Eddington, astronomer of England, one of the greatest names in that science;

Dr. W. R. Whitney, head of the research labratory of General Electric;

Professor Arthur Compton, physicist of Chicago University;

Professor Michael Pupin, physicist of Columbia University, New York;

Professor Robert Millikin, physicist, California Institute of Technology, California;

Professor Harold Shapley, astronomer, Harvard, Boston, Massachusetts;

Professor Charles P. Olivier, astronomer at the University of Pennsylvania;

Professor Albert Einstein of Germany, physicist;

Professor P. W. Bridgeman, physicist, Harvard—these men believe in God.

Here indeed is an inspiring list of men who are recognized scientists, men who are leading the van of modern science, whose experiments are leaving the science of twenty years ago almost remotely behind them; and these men believe in the Creator and His creative intelligent purposings. This fact alone makes it perfectly clear that unbelief, atheism, is not an intellectual conclusion, but a chosen point of view.

The world in which every man lives is, in a way, the world he wants to live in. The libertine would not find his life comfortable in a world that echoed and re-echoed with God and righteousness: so he does not have one. Proud intellectual self-sufficiency and conscious power would not be comfortable with a philosophy of things that make humility and dependence Godward fundamental: so it does not adopt them. A man's moral choices and personal reactions have as much to do with his intellectual conclusions in speculative science and ultimate philosophy as his information does.

Babson speaks of the self-sufficiency of children that is making them independent of their parents, and the self-sufficiency of parents that is making them independent of God; and it is here rather than in learning that we have the rise of modern unbelief.

But physics is reacting toward faith, because it finds the objective universe dissolving away before our eyes. Matter has become a mere pulsation. This sphere of the ultimately small is found to be lawless, it discloses an element of uncertainty. The old mechanical universe in space and time is gone, the Creator, His thoughts, His purposes are revealed by every fact about us.

And then, more important still, there is the world within,—and this world after all is the one we know most immediately. The world within! It is deep with God; and in exploring the values of this world the man who prays and worships, who passionately persues the ideal, is he who speaks with most authority; is he who is entitled to the recognition which belongs to the specialist.

Let me put it this way: We are grateful for the light of Jeans and Einstein. They have answered naturalistic, mechanistic speculations in science. They have made mind, will, purpose the ultimate facts. They have confirmed the soul's deep consciousness of its freedom by exploding the myth of an all-comprehending mechanical causation. They have given us back ourselves and God; but now that we are thus scientifically repossessed of life's best we will explore these values in our own souls, and will find again the Christian Bible their supreme expression and definition.

Let us put it down atheism and infidelity are not an intellectual conclusion, but a choice; yet because it is so frequent a choice in our days, and because it is such an aggressive propaganda, it behooves the Christian Church to face it with attention. Dr. John F. Frazer's most important article from the *Watchman Examiner* now follows immediately.

Faith on the Earth or Is the World Going Red?

Annual Sermon to the Pastors Conference of the New York State Convention

JOHN F. FRASER, D.D.

In a recent interview Gilbert K. Chesterton

was asked if he thought Christianity had been benefited by the World War. He replied: "Christianity is fighting for its life; it thrives on persecution." When it was suggested that in keeping with such reasoning it should flourish in Russia where it is being destroyed by fire and sword, he expatiated: "You can drive religion under ground, but you cannot destroy it; Christianity was never stronger than in the catacombs." Mr. Chesterton's observation, though seemingly keen, is quite out of date. It is not fire and sword that endanger Christianity in Russia. It is, rather, an atheistic system of education.

It is well known that in Russia the primary qualification of a first-class communist is to be an out-and-out atheist. But we should not forget that Soviet communism has just taken over the throne room of the Romanoff dynasty. The Red flag is the answer to the tyranny of the cross in Russia. As long as the cross was erect in the palace religious intolerance prevailed in the street. And so it has come to pass for the first time in history there is a government conceived in atheism, for atheism and by atheists; and that government controls the largest national population in Europe. There it is that Christianity is despised as a social menace, and atheism has become the religion of the State. It is possibly true that most of the Russian peasantry are faithfully or furtively religious, but the government and education are combined to destroy belief in God.

How far the political revulsion against Christianity has spread may not interest you in this discussion, but at least the diffusion of rationalistic learning should arouse our attention. The preacher whose information is up-to-date scarcely will escape the feeling that there are hard days ahead for the Christian ministry. More than twenty-five years ago Marcus Dods said to a group of young preachers: "I do not envy those who will fight the battles of Christianity in the twentieth century. Yes, perhaps I do, but it will be a stiff fight." He spoke as a prophet.

Religion and Science

Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn hardly can be suspected of religious sensationalism, but that eminent scientist in addressing a group of religious leaders made the following statement: "The contest of theology with science has been fatal to the Christian code of morals, largely throughout the world. Decadence, degeneracy and the wiping out of standards are much worse than you think; for the revolution is sweeping with tremendous force among the young, and their moral sense is lost." These words are weighty with meaning, and it is witless to regard them lightly. In the latest document from his pen a distinguished Christian teacher at the head of the department of philosophy in a great American university makes the observation: "Once doubt was cautious and urbane; now it is often truculent. So abundant and active are the skeptics that the magazines are written by a new crop of doubters every month, and no man's mind can retain the year's output of skeptical books. It is unusual to find a group of university students in which the majority believe in a personal God. . . The rising tide of doubt is too evident to be ignored." Warnings are multiplying in these days of learned chuckle, and no one acquainted with the academic literature of our time will look to the popular philosophers with thoughts of finding religious faith. The writings of Nietzsche and Fritz Mauthner, of Santayana and Bertrand Russell—and all their satellites—combine in the understanding that there is no God.

Religion and Journalism

When we turn to the journalists and popular writers it is astonishing to find so formidable an array of brilliant authors giving their dialetics to refute the basic affirmations of the Christian faith. *The Twilight of Christianity* is an attractive title of a book by Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, and many an unsuspecting eye has read its pages looking for religious light, but only to find that the *Twilight* abolishes all light for the soul of man and leaves him without a single star of hope beyond his little day. It is a religion for the faithless. Walter Lippmann, at one time the gifted editor of the New York *World*, wrote his *Preface to Morals* for those who accept the renouncement of religious standards—a meaningless appropriation of Santayana's ideas. Time would fail me to speak of the newspapers that conspire to discredit the Bible in favor of a vague pantheism at one time and a crass materialism at another. Neither can I name the long list of lecturers available for women's clubs, a roster headed by Clarence Darrow, far-famed advocate of criminals, enemy of constitutional law, and the Billy Sunday of organized atheism, who offers his talent in discourse or debate to prove that God is a fiction and the Eighteenth Amendment a farce.

If, on the other hand, we should turn to public education in search of religious faith it is to be feared we shall not be rewarded in our quest. When we review the theories in education method and look to the most prominent of our colleges in teacher training we are inclined to suspect that the tree of knowledge is Red to the roots and that seeds of anarchy are being sown in our American schools. The whole method of education is designed to train the mind of youth in habits of skepticism. Nothing may be accepted as truth that cannot be brought into the category of tested knowledge; it must be proved like a proposition in Euclid or substantiated by convincing evidence —in which case he will be a wise child who knows his own father. I have certain sympathy for those who hear these warnings only to shrug their shoulders and feel that the watchdogs of orthodoxy are barking up the wrong tree. But I cannot pooh-pooh the protests when they come from eminent authorities and educators of the highest standing. Surely it is time to awake when so reliable a writer as Dr. William McDougall, of Duke University, states: "Never before the present century has sheer dogmatic materialism been propagated by a vast system of public instruction and by universities of the highest standing, counting their students by tens of thousands." Professor McDougall is speaking of behaviorism, which is atheistic to the core, and he declares that the educational policy of our country is increasingly molded by this theory.

The Christian College and Leadership

We Baptists always have believed in and insisted on the separation of church and state as a sound principle both for freedom in religion and in education. If it has come to pass, however, that we have renounced the teaching of religion in the State schools to witness an atheistic approach to the knowledge of life, then I, for one, will contend that the Roman Catholic Church is within her just rights when she demands the parochial school where she may train her children in a religious acquaintance with knowledge. There was a time when some of us felt that the denominational college was a needless drag on our financial resources, because the State schools could furnish superior facilities for the education of our young people. My own feeling has changed in that I see little hope for Christian leadership of the future apart from the Christian college.

Christianity does not face the danger of destruction by persecution. It faces the greater danger of being ignored. Ours is not the fear of dungeon, fire and sword. It is the fear of Nemesis, after quarantine at the hands of those who are to teach our children the meanings of the universe and the destiny of an atom. Our youthful inquirers are not being directed to the saints for their theology; they are referred to the popular writers who never experienced the Christian outlook and who never worked at religion outside the library. It is passing strange that in every field of inquiry the student is supposed to consult experienced authority save in the realm of religion. This situation reminds us of the letter of Sir Isaac Newton to Halley when the latter asserted his unbelief. The famous author of the *Principia* said:

"I always attend to you, Dr. Halley, with the greatest deference when you do us the honor to converse on astronomy or the mathematics, because these are subjects which you have industriously investigated, and which you well understand; but religion is a subject on which I always hear you with pain, because this is a subject which you have not seriously examined and do not comprehend; you despise it because you have not studied it, and you will not study it because you despise it."

In these days it is not easy to be a preacher. There was a time when the Christian minister, schooled in theology, could defend his doctrine with a syllogism or protect his faith behind the ramparts of revealed religion. When science drove him from these positions he could fight still with his back to the wall, contending for the validity of an experience of the Divine Spirit in his own life. But now comes into the field a youthful psychology to discredit the reality of the inward experience and refute the believer's awareness of God. Psychology does not attack religion with the sword; it approaches religion with a smile, and with the uplifted brow. It does not persecute religion; it examines, analyzes, and tells you how it all happens. The God idea is a fatherhood fixation still clinging to man from his childhood! Religious faith is the outgrowth of fear stimuli we have carried over from an animal ancestry; and prayer is expression of our *ego*-centric interests growing out of desire complexes! How very simple it all is to that group of psychologists who use the lingo of behaviorism and believe in nothing except their own strange vocabulary.

But when we turn to the church we are not tempted to believe that behavioristic definitions

are strikingly descriptive? Who of us does not know of scores who would have little of religious interest left were they to lose their fear of hell, their thought of the church as an ark of safety and their belief in a prayer-god to whom they will go only when they want something? When we pastors hear of faith as a "defense mechanism" and prayer as a "desire complex," are we not embarrassed by the pictorial force of the psychologist's language? Now that we have passed into the era of census-taking and analytical surveys we are not like to be deceived by a blind optimism proclaiming that all is well with the church. What man of us is not aware of the problem in his own parish where faith and fidelity are so often out of correspondence with membership records? Most of us are familiar with Dr. Fry's tabulations, *The United States Looks at Its Churches;* but we have also a personal acquaintance with enough of supplemental data to keep us humble.

Faith and the Church

On the other hand, every one of us knows that it is within the church we must look for faith on the earth. To whatever extent the leaven of the kingdom may be operative in a world influenced by Christian ideal and character, it is not in that world we shall find ample evidence of the Christian motive or the witness of the Christian life. Even as we would look within the garden to discover the facts about horticulture, so must we look within the church of Christ to find the truth about the Christian faith. We know that Freudian language is utterly irrelevant when we face the history of that Christian movement of the first century. Psychological reasoning can never be made to fit the facts we know about the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. The impressive phrases of behaviorism are obviously futile when applied to countless martyrs who faced the fires of persecution with a courage more glorious than was ever known among the Roman legions. The modern missionary movement is a perplexing theme to those who believe that religion is a shelter humanity has built for self-preservation; and the life of many a living saint holds utter refutation of the mechanistic explanations of Christian character—of self-sacrifice and dauntless adventure inspired by the spirit of a believing church.

Triumphant Faith

But within the ranks of Christendom these are days of great confusion and sad misunderstanding. Sectarian differences and sub-denominational conflicts are not likely to be the chief concern of the modern pulpit. The great problem before us is that of an unbelieving world. When Professor Osborn declares that the revolution is sweeping with tremendous force among the young, and their moral sense is lost; when we are told that no man's memory can retain the year's output of skeptical books; when a great teacher of philosophy tells us that the rising tide of doubt is too evident to be ignored; and another trusted authority writes that the educational policy of our country is increasingly molded by dogmatic materialism, may we not well ask, "Is the world going Red?"

"It will be a stiff fight," said Marcus Dods. We are inclined to believe that. There are many Christian leaders who feel that the battle line of the future will not be between this and that theological school, but that all who believe in God, as personal, immanent and transcendent, will be banded together to hold his name high and lifted up in the earth, as opposed to those who are determined that our children shall be compelled to choose either a vague pantheism or a Godless philosophy of life.

There are thousands who look on things coming to pass with deepening faith, confident that these are events the Scriptures foretold—accurately as the prognosis of the pathologist and more certainly than the forecasts of the weather bureau. Seeing the spread of atheism, organized and determined as never before, they read with a new sense of assurance the prophecy of the anti-Christ. They are told of wars and rumors of war just when the nations had promised us peace. They behold hunger and poverty when yesterday we reveled in prosperity. They see the world in a state of nervousness—a tense expectancy as if something cataclysmic were about to take place—a sense of crisis on every hand. They read the story of the scarlet woman and witness the waving of the red flag, the spread of revolutionary movements and incipient anarchy in the Orient, in Europe and America. And if that were all, I would want to quit and so would you. But thank heaven the Scriptures do not place the crown on the head of the scarlet woman. The song of triumph does not issue from her lips, but rather does it belong to that chorus of whom it is written: "They overcame by the blood of the Lamb."

* * *

Sheep in the care of a false shepherd are always in peril.—*Southern Methodist.*

Christian Evidences

BISHOP H. M. DUBOSE, D.D.,LL.D.

Pagan Elements in Extant Philosophy

THE reader will understand that the purpose of this series of papers is to point out what should be the connections of philosophy with the evidences underlying religious faith and experience. Nor is the purpose less to indicate wherein the processes of philosophy too often have failed to move to logical conclusions in support of the records of revelation. But many of the shortcomings of discussional thought, which is mainly what, at present, passes for philosophy, have been inherited from a far away beginning. The sins of the philosophers have been brought over by certain schools from the philosophical mind of the past.

Philosophy, strictly so named, is of pagan origin, counting as pagan the immortals of the Grecian academy, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest. All but directly from the trio here named, Greek philosophy passed to Christian hands. It, therefore, is not surprising that it should have brought to its Christian legatees some of its pagan accidents, and that these should be such as, to a greater or less degree, qualify Christian ideals of truth. It is to the more apparent of these pagan accidents, or qualities, of philosophy that we are addressing the arguments of the present discourse. In pursuance of our plan, we shall presently consider those pagan conceptions of creation, revelation, and religious experience which passed with the methods of pagan reasoning into the trends of Christian thought.

Greek philosophy is more chargeable for what it did not do, and, in the nature of the case, could not do, in respect of religious truth, than for what it actually set forth. The definite failure to see and name a divine personal Creator of the universe was more the fault of Greek theology than of Greek philosophy. However, in this necessary lack, it anticipated the studied attempts of Christian pragmatism to qualify the claim made by revelation for the direct creation of the universe by Almighty God.

The Greek failure to credit creation to the choice and power of a personal Creator was due to the absence of a revelation concerning the nature and unity of the Godhead. The failure of the nominally Christian philosophical mind to give this credit is due to the bias of precedent, to scholastic pride and to a lack of reverent inquiry. It is perverse and deliberate. A serious minded writer in the *New York Times,* a few weeks ago, described the present philosophical trend in America as "neo-paganism." The allegation is not without justification.

The wisest of the Greeks saw creation as a secondary process. With Pythagoras (or the Pythagoreans), it was not God who said: "Let there be light, and there was light"; but it was out of light, or the "central fire," originated through no distinctly identified force, that all things came, subsequently to be regulated by "the harmony of numerical ratios"—"the music of the spheres."

With other Greek teachers, atoms were eternal, and these, in fortuitous comminglings, became the sufficient cause of such order and movement as were assumed by life and form. At most, a Deity who existed in spite of the pantheon of lesser gods, through emenations, or otherwise delegated powers, permitted the coming to pass of nature, while himself withdrawn to a distance measureless to man.

This pagan heredity, consciously or unconsciously, has asserted itself in extant scholastic philosophy. Half the labor of world thought on the higher lines of science and inquiry, especially during the past century, has been spent to the end of bringing philosophy to complete its cycle without admitting the instant, personal Creatorship of Jehovah. Evasive theories have been multiplied. Suppositions have been suspended by the forelock from generation to generation. Primordial force, selective energy and orders of transmutation, all of which are normal to science, and are not absent from Bible cosmology, have been given abnormal office and

initiative, with leave to create without mention of a higher Cause. It is a pagan referendum.

The half way house between the Greek *genesis* and modern Christian pragmatism was the gnosticism of the latter part of the first century, and later. In that welter of theological and cosmological heresies the demiurgus, the eons and the emenations built and ruled the worlds in fantastic strife and assertiveness. The philosophy of modern criticism and scientific monism has appropriated the principles of this heresy, only substituting a blind force for the demiurge and the eons. It was against this particular Greek conception, just then in transition into gnosticism, that St. Paul affirmed at Mars Hill: "God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth." There is need in Christian audience for a repetition of this apostolic challenge.

The popular Greek ideal of revelation was confined to the oracles and the tokens of animal sacrifices. That is, there were certain seats of divination where the diviners, chiefly women, were supposed to receive communications from the gods; while peculiarities of the intestines and other parts of the altar sacrifices were taken to give the minds of the particular gods invoked. The oracles were enigmatical and contradictory, and were susceptible of varying interpretations, which stamped them as spurious, or else as resulting from hallucinations and mental abstractions of the diviners. It was an open secret that the tripod of the oracle at Delphi was placed above a fissure in the rock which constituted the temple's foundation; and that this fissure exhaled gases that intoxicated the priestess, resulting in abstractions and incoherent mental images. These, when put into words, were accepted and interpreted as coming from the house of the gods.

In addition to the popular Greek understanding of revelation, some of the later philosophers held a higher view concerning divine communications. Socrates believed that a good demon told him each day of any evil that should befall him; but this view was personal and indefinite, and seemed to be confined to the voice of warning. Even with this superlatively great heathen, there was no conception of such theophanies as those embodied in Hebrew prophecies. The Holy Ghost did not there move men to speak. Alas, it was not so much as known if there were any Holy Ghost. What, at worst, with these heathen teachers, was but complacent ignorance of fact, too often, has been with their Christian successors wilfull disregard of truth.

Not only have the lapses and fortuities of pagan philosophy influenced Christian thinking up to the present; but, like glacial moraines, actual accretions of paganism have been brought over to the fairer and happier tracts of Christian thought, where they have been deposited, and where they have remained, to cumber and vex the soil of truth. These precedents have been permitted to stand as though they were fundamentals of the mind. For truth's sake, pagan philosophy could not make peace with pagan myths; but for its own consistency, pseudo Christian philosophy must make myths out of the truths of revelation!

Thus the new psychology has practically cut itself off from the thought of revelation. There is no place in its scheme for a will or a choice beyond the mental caprices of humanity. Spiritual illumination and activity practically stop at the tips of the fingers. If there is a spiritual macrocosm, little evidence of it is found in the brain and consciousness of man. What men have supposed to be the answer of the larger world, the new psychologist finds to be delusion and unscientific vagaries.

The modernistic mind, falling leagues below the candor of the Greek mind, charges the miracles of revelation to myth, affectional emotion and tendency. The adjective "cataleptic" has been applied to the heaven-revealing visions of St. Paul. Not a few metaphysicians see no difference between the oracle of Delphi and the "burdens" of Old Testament prophecy. In seeking to explain away the "lively oracles" of Jehovah, they conjure up marvels and miracles transcending those they seek to deny.

Neither in their literature nor in their philosophy did the Greeks leave any deposit or token that resembled the Christian doctrine of experience. This was a logical consequence of the absence from their cult of the knowledge of sin, of divine forgiveness, and of atonement. Christian experience turns on these as elements of life and thought. Without them, experience is a barren intellectualism. It requires no involved process to explain the situation which met St. Paul when he offered Christ crucified to Greek scholastics. "Foolishness!" was the laconic answer, an answer which has rung its baleful changes through the philosophies of many ages and many lands. Today, in the midst of the most contradictory conditions that have ever beset Christian thought, it too sadly is evident that that section of philosophy which

largely assumes to speak for evangelical thought and activity simply describes *in loco* its Greek original. It is pagan.

Within recent weeks, I have listened to the lecture room discourses of certain religious educational psychologists, whose multiple plans for unfolding the religious life of childhood and adolescence contained but scant suggestion of the spiritual crisis involved in personal salvation, "Ye must be born again." It is not that education, as to its most instant and comprehensive details, is to be decried; but it is that without the birth from above, without the momently ministered power of the Spirit, it must be ineffective in the life of adult, adolescent, or tender child of conscious years. As things are so largely asserting themselves today in the programme of so named Christian education, one is moved to ask if the academy is not taking the place of the Galilean walk. Much of that which is vaunted as Christian education looks alarmingly like a plan to educate the real Christ and the real Book out of our faith. What is this but paganism?

In a very modern book, recently uttered, a professor in one of our Church schools begs the conservatives and the faithful to blandly accept the platter which our philosophers have covered for us. He pleads that resistence be not offered to those who have shattered our gospel and its revelation, but that aggressive agreement be given in pushing forward the remnants of truth left, to whatever goal we may. It is bland and puerile. In the meantime, how much of our philosophy is pagan? How much of our theology is not Christian?

Nashville, Tennessee.

Current Scientific Discoveries

By Professor George McCready Price, A.M.

Modernism is not Modern Enough

THE entire trouble with those who boast of being Modernists is that they are trusting to the *zeit-geist,* or the spirit of the times, in opposition to the Revelation which God has given us; whereas this *zeit-geist* is always really behind the times. For real scientific discovery always keeps a few jumps ahead of the spirit of the times, the latter being based on what science taught yesterday. It is yesterday's science, yesterday's criticism, yesterday's archaeology, which the self-styled Modernists always have before their eyes. Whereas the best science is always advancing, always changing, usually changing for the better. By the time the world has popularized any scientific philosophy, the best and most progressive has already outgrown that particular phase; so that the Modernist, in proclaiming his sturdy adherence to the spirit of the times is always a little belated, sometimes ridiculously belated.

Those who can remember back to the latter years of the nineteenth century, or thirty-five or forty years ago, will distinctly recall the hard, iron determinism which pervaded all scientific thought, the result of the crude mechanical view of the universe taught by the physical sciences of that time. The reign of law seemed to preclude the possibility of miracle; and those religious leaders who tuned in to the spirit of that day found themselves struggling against a current of doubt and unbelief which seemed sure to sweep away the whole Christian economy. But the New Physics has changed all this, has changed it radically and completely. Yet how many Modernists are modern enough to know that this old mechanical determinism is now out of date?

A very important principle to remember in this connection is that the spirit of the times has always been wrong. This is illustrated by many periods in the world's history. Everybody knows that the Sadducees were the Modernists in the time of Christ. They had become captivated by the prevailing Hellenism of their age, they accepted it and tried to shape up their Jewish religion to fit it. As one writer has expressed it, these Sadducees were men of the world, and men of *this* world; and the world which they accepted and lived for was

that form of life and thinking which worshipped at the shrine of Greek culture. But that Greek culture is now dead and gone, and the Modernism of that day has gone with it, while the gospel as taught by Paul and the other disciples is the most alive and the most up-to-date system of thinking in all the world.

Another phase of the eternal conflict between Christianity and so-called Modernism is illustrated by the times of Galileo. Very definite ideas of physics and astronomy were taught in the universities, ideas which were a hang-over from the days of Aristotle. But those of the Catholic Church who wished to be regarded as bright and keen had completely swallowed all these prevailing ideas about the physical world, and had made these theories in physics and astronomy a part of their system of theology. These theries were as universally taught then as Evolution and Destructive Criticism are today. Yet they were all wrong, hopelessly and entirely wrong. And when Galileo brought out facts which were much more nearly true, much more in harmony with reality, he had a dreadful time to get these ideas before the world. Contrary to the usual view of the case, however, it was not the Catholic Church as such which opposed and persecuted Galileo, but that wing of the Church which prided itself on being the most modern and the most scientific. It was the false science of his day which hounded Galileo, and tried to close his mouth, a false system of science which was enthroned as a triumphant orthodoxy in the chairs of all the universities, just as evolution is enthroned today.

It was the same in the time of the Deism contemporary with Voltaire. In that day, the Deists prided themselves on their modernity, on their scientific knowledge. And this science they declared was utterly contrary to the supernatural element in the Bible. They were glib at quoting Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries, also the discoveries of Galileo, and the philosophy of Descartes and Leibnitz. Oh, yes; they were very modern and up to date. But where are they all now? And what if the evangelical Church had taken those deistic speculations so seriously as to revamp her religion in conformity thereto? Thank God, the revival under the Wesleys came into the Church, and the spirit of Deistic Modernism was swept away like the mists of night before the blaze of the morning sun.

In every single case that I can think of, all down the pathway of the years, the *zeit-geist* has always been wrong. Sometimes it has been further and more accurate scientific discoveries which have set the world more nearly right, as in the time of Galileo. Sometimes a burning pentecostal revival has quickened the dead bones into a new life, as in the time of John Wesley. This widespread apostasy in the name of contemporary culture, followed by revival and calling the wandering multitudes back to a firmer belief in the revealed Word of God, has been repeated so many times, over and over again, that the cycle seems almost monotonous. And certain is it that in every single case of this sort the "Modernism" of its day was only a temporary phase of life and of thought, passing away with fuller or more accurate knowledge. And how sad the fate of those who looked upon the popular ideas of contemporary culture as the real thing, as something permanent and worthy of the trust of the hungry soul.

Prof. J. H. A. Hart, of Cambridge University, has the following apt remarks about the Sadducees, who it must be remembered were the Modernists of their day:

"The Sadducees were the hypocrites of the Jewish world, just as the Epicureans were the hypocrites of the Greek world. The rest of the Jews rated the Sadducees as atheists, just as the rest of the Greeks rated the Epicureans as atheists and discerned, as Plutarch said, the sardonic grin behind the mask of their obsequious devotion to the ceremonies at which the force of public opinion compelled their attendance. The Sadducee was a Jew outwardly so long as he retained place, power and profit. . . . They knew well enough the power of invincible Rome; and her advance warned them to take themselves and their talents to the market of the wide world, to which in heart and mind they had always belonged."

No, the spirit of the age has almost invariably been wrong. But blessed are they who have held fast their allegiance to truth when all the world seemed against it.

Then to side with Truth is noble,
When we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit,
And 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses,
While the coward stands aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit,
Till his Lord is crucified,
And the multitude make virtue
Of the faith they had denied.

Berrien Springs, Michigan.

The Pulpit

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D. FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D.,LL.D. CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY,D.D.
I. M. HARGETT, D.D. MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D. REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK
ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D. WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D.,LL.D. THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

"God's Corner"

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

Thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field.—Lev. 23:22.

THIS commandment is like a gleam of blue in the stern and gray sky of the Old Testament. The law came by Moses, and grace and truth by Jesus Christ. But we err if we think that there was no grace and tenderness in the Old Testament dispensation. The law was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ; but it was always the friend and the benefactor of mankind. In this thunder of the chorus of God's law there are sweet interludes of haunting melody. Here is one of them: "Thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field." The grapes were not to be plucked twice, nor the olive trees to be beaten twice, nor the corners of the field to be reaped, nor the grain that had dropped in the first reaping to be gathered.

This provision was for the sake of the stranger, the poor and the needy. How one of these laws worked is beautifully illustrated for us in that wonderful idyll, The Book of Ruth. When she went into the field of Boaz, Ruth gleaned after the harvesters; that is, she gathered up the grain which they had left behind them as they crossed the fields, and more, too, which had been thrown in her path by the designed carelessness of the reapers at the command of Boaz.

Land, soil, is the one fundamental economic question upon which depend all others. From the earliest time this subject has been discussed, and this and that plan proposed, and from time to time there have been great social upheavals and revolutions on the part of those who felt that they were being defrauded of their rights to mother earth.

There are three theories as to the ownership of land. One, the individual, that each man by his own labor and saving has a right to possess a part of the earth. The second, what we might call the communistic, that no man can own any part of the earth, that it belongs to mankind, and that every man has an inherent right to the earth, the soil, and its products, just as he has an inherent right, and inalienable, to the air and the sunshine. The third theory is the Hebrew, and that of the Old Testament, that the land does not belong to the individual, nor to the community, but to God. This was the meaning of the law, "Thou shalt not sell the land, for the land is Mine."

In the year of jubilee this fact was emphasized by the land reverting to its original owners. If a man purchased a field twenty-five years after the year of jubilee, he paid only half as much as he would have paid had he purchased it in the year of jubilee with the usufruct fifty years before him.

The advantage of such a system was that it guarded against poverty on one hand, and injustice and oppression on the other. There could be no piling up of those vast estates which have become a curse and a menace to the world, and a root of bitterness, and a fountain of social unrest.

Even during the period of his quasi ownership or rental of the land, the man who occupied the land was reminded by a number of regulations that the land was not his, but God's. Among these regulations was this provision, that when he reaped a field he was not to reap the corners of the field. There the grain was to be left standing for the benefit of the stranger, the poor, and the needy, for even in that far off, ancient period, and under a divine economy, it was recognized as Christ recognized it centuries afterwards, that always there would be the poor.

For us the principle underlying this ancient bit of legislation is a living law. The corner of the field is not to be wholly gleaned. The field itself, after we have put into it our investment of labor and money and care, is not ours, but God's. God reminds us of this by telling us that although he grants us the use of the

field as a whole, the corners of the field belong to Him. There we are not to reap. It makes no difference whether the field is small or large, whether a man is, as we say, dependent or independent (which really means that he depends upon the labors of others), the corner of the field is not for ourselves, but for others.

God gives us a field of talent and strength and energy and time. We have no right to claim this as our own, for God bestowed it upon us, and a sign of that divine ownership is found in our devoting a part of the field to God in the ministry for others. God has made this especially clear as to time.

"Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord Thy God." This corner of the week belongs to God. It was never intended to be used by man just for the sake of amusement or recreation. It has a definite relationship to man's spiritual life and the claims of God upon his soul.

No one ever heard of a man whose fortune was impaired, whose health was broken down, or whose morality was undermined by keeping that corner of the week for God. But we have heard of many whose health was impaired, whose fortune was wrecked, and whose morals were undermined by taking that day just like every other day for self.

John Bright, the great and eloquent tribune of the working people in England, when speaking of the Sabbath, used to repeat that fine cuplet of George Herbert:

> The week were dark without Thy light,
> Thy torch doth show the way.

Sometimes I hear a man say, when he is asked to take a part in some Christian work, "I haven't time." What he is doing is to confess that he is going to take the whole of the week, the whole of God's field of time, for himself. After an experience of some years, my observation is that those upon whom the Church must count for help in its great work are not those who have the greatest leisure, but those who are the hardest driven and the busiest, but who realize that the corner of the field belongs to God.

When a man says, "I haven't time," he simply means that he has not been gripped by the Gospel, that it has not made even a surface dent on his character and personality. Those who say "I haven't time" ought to remember that they must all at length take time to die and stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ and give an account of the use they have made of what God gave them in this world.

In the field of money the corner belongs to God. What a strange thing money is! Just a few coins in the hand, or a bit of paper in the wallet, and yet those coins and that paper measure the gulf which yawns between shelter and food and raiment on one side, and cold, and hunger and nakedness on the other. Money has often been denounced as the great curse of the human family. But money has its moral significance. It is not money itself, but the abuse of it and the worship of it which is denounced in the Scriptures. It is only when we think of money in that sense that we can say about money what Leonardo da Vinci says in his notebooks:

> There shall come forth out of dark and gloomy caves that which shall cause the whole human race to undergo great afflictions, perils and death. To many of those who follow it, after much tribulation it will yield delight; but whosoever pays it no homage will die in want and misery. It shall bring to pass an endless number of crimes; it shall prompt and incite wretched men to assassinate, to steal, and to enslave; it shall hold its own followers in suspicion; it shall deprive free cities of their rank; it shall take away life itself from many; it shall make men torment each other with many kinds of subterfuge, deceit and treacheries.
>
> O vile monster! How much better were it for men that thou shouldst go back to hell! For this the vast forests shall be stripped of their trees; for this an infinite number of creatures shall lose their lives.

The Scotch are made the butt of much jest and ridicule because of their alleged parsimony. But it is in part due to the fact that the Scottish people have recognized the moral significance of money that they have scored so deep a mark in history. In the getting, the saving and especially the spending of money, a man's moral character is tested; and an examination of a man as to his dealings with money would take us into almost every area of a man's life.

Money has been defined as that something which buys everything but happiness, and takes a man everywhere but heaven. But money used in the right way can confer a great deal of happiness and be the means of starting many a person on the path to heaven.

When Alexander the Great died, he left directions that his empty hands should be on view outside his coffin. By this he meant to teach that of all his vast wealth and conquests he could take nothing with him. That is always true. But if a man has used money as God intended it to be used, he can take with him incorruptible goods and leave behind him imperishable blessings.

What could be meaner than to reap the corners and steal from God? Shall a man rob God? With the Hebrews, just as in their use of time, the reservation of money was not left to individual taste or fancy, but the law was that the tenth was to be devoted to God's work. It is easy enough to say that we are no longer under Old Testament dispensation, and that no Christian wants to be bound down by any rigid law, and that he ought to exceed what was required of the Jew. But in almost every case it will be found that where a Christian is not making a definite plan for what he shall give to God, his unsystematic and spasmodic giving falls far below that of him who gives regularly and lays by in store as the Lord has blessed him. With a great number of people, their giving may be described as patronizing God. It's like the quarter or half dollar that a man gives to a Pullman porter when he gets off the train in the morning.

Once I knew a Baptist,
He had a pious look,
He had been totally immersed—
Except his pocketbook.

He put a nickel in the plate,
And then with might and main,
He'd sing, When we asunder part,
It gives us inward pain.

I also knew a Methodist,
Who couldn't sin, he said,
He'd holler "Glory!" loud enough
To almost wake the dead.

But as to his apportionment,
Though his barns were waxing fat,
His shouting wasn't loud enough
To ever quite raise that.

There are two kinds of money—mortal and immortal. Ther is money which stinks of corruption, money traced with blood and tears and minted out of broken hearts; money stamped with the features of lust and greed and hate, and which clinks with the cries of the wronged, the defrauded and oppressed; money engraved with curses and maledictions; money which burns the hand which holds it like the thirty pieces of silver with which the traitor sold his God.

But there is another kind of money, not mortal, but immortal money: money which is medicine to the sick, food for the hungry, clothing for the naked, homes for the homeless, the crutch for the cripple, the eyes for the blind, windows for the prisoner, songs for the songless, smiles for the tear-stained face, and wings for the earthbound soul. This is no filthy lucre, but that pure gold out of which are built the gates of heaven and with which its streets are paved. This is the treasure laid up in heaven where moth doth not corrupt and where thieves do not break through and steal. So to have used one's money is to join the choir invisible of those immortal dead that live again in minds made better by their presence.

Remember, then, God's corner, and leave a part of your strength, your time, your friendship, your affection, your talent, and your money for others. To do so is to bless not only those for whom the corner of the field is preserved, but to bless yourself and to discover how true it is that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Then when at length the summons comes, and sometimes very suddenly, "This night thy soul shall be required of thee," when you leave the world, you leave behind something more than that fool of the Gospel who left behind him nothing but bursting barns. You leave behind you ever-flowing streams of benefaction, fadeless flowers of gratitude, and you go hence to receive the "Well done" of Him Who said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

* * *

Genesis and Revelation

In Genesis I see earth created; in Revelation I see it passing away.

In Genesis sun and moon appear; in Revelation I read they have no need of the sun or moon.

In Genesis there is the marriage of the first Adam; in Revelation there is the marriage of the second Adam.

In Genesis there is the first grim appearance of the great enemy Satan; in Revelation there is his final doom.

In Genesis there is the inauguration of sorrow and suffering; you hear the first sob, you see the first tear; in Revelation there is no more sorrow, no more pain, and all tears are wiped away.

In Genesis we hear the mutter of the curse which falls because of sin; in Revelation we read "there shall be no more curse."

In Genesis we see man driven out from the garden with the tree of life; in Revelation we see him welcomed back with the tree of life at his disposal.—*Selected.*

* * *

"The more our life bears witness that the body is for the Lord, the more we also experience that the Lord is for the body."—*Murray.*

The Church in Europe

By Frederick Hasskarl, M.A.,B.D.

Some Observations of an American Seminary Graduate

TRAVELING with an open mind is, we believe, the best antidotes against certain prejudice and misunderstanding, for we are compelled to make constant readjustments on the basis of presented evidence. It is not unreasonable that this should take place. From childhood to manhood our impressions are undergoing a constant revision. As we approach the truth our perspective changes.

Every journey to a strange land begins with a confused mind. Environment and early training will influence us in the choice of what we hope to see. The student of theology will focus his attention upon the expression of spiritual activity. The cathedrals and centers of learning will be of especial interest. As he looks across the sea he will trace in his mind the events that led post Reformation Europe in two directions—one back to Rome, the other with the Protestant Church toward the future. He will find one content to follow the past emotionally, the other eager to seek out the future reasonably.

The coast of France, on a beautiful summer morning, with its mingling odors of the land and sea brought us at last to reality. Here was the old world.

The cathedral at Chartres must be seen in the late afternoon. At this time the setting sun creates on the stained glass windows (the finest in the world) a harmonious doxology in color to the closing day. Here is something of the presence of God.

The organ music in Notre Dame at Paris presents another phase of this quiet devotional atmosphere. We are in a silence so vast the music drifts away into space as clouds in the soft evening breezes. We in a great practical age feel this deeply. What peace simply to sit and pray as though God were near.

Rheims, so much a part of the history of France, with its lavish processions of kings and armies, stands before us. Here truly is one of the finest Gothic cathedrals of the world. But it stands before us now with wounds from the last great conflict. It stood an emblem of man's spiritual aspirations, now it speaks another message. The shell holes in its sides remind us of the voice of One who at one time said, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Is not here evidence that our faith must be expressed in terms more durable than even stone and iron.

Here was beauty and feeling. The Gothic cathedral is the creation not of a state organization or even of an international church; it was raised by men who felt the drive of life, and had a sense of harmony that arises from strenuous endeavor. Here rich and poor had labored side by side. The aged understood this burdensome labor for the multitude of their sins; but what urged the boys and children to work? Here was great enthusiasm, practical spiritual effort. Do not these houses of God prove the possibility of expressing the countless vitalities of a great age and making men feel that here, in truth, were houses which brought God to earth and raised man to the gate of Heaven. After this art of co-operative building died out the individual was to come to the fore.

A difference in the country side became apparent as we journeyed toward the east. The humble herds and peaceful meadows reflected the orderliness of the German. In the distance stood the twin spires of the cathedral of Cologne. Only in its immediate presence does one appreciate the vastness of this house of God. But one is conscious of a change; the airy lightness of the French Gothic is gone. Though this is the largest Gothic cathedral in the world it lacks the sublime repose of the best French cathedrals. Zola once defined art as the world as seen through a temperament.

We view our first German university with

mingling emotion and disappointment. The sabre and student songs are over shadowed by the practical aspect of things. Our own student days had brought us face to face with the contributions of the German university to the universal store of knowledge. Great giants of the intellect had walked these plain halls of learning. The printed page and conversation with men who had had actual contact made the names of some of these men familiar. Here we had come to learn were pioneers in search of knowledge. The world was witnessing in all fields of learning the birth of a new vitality. The pioneering spirit of a Martin Luther was still abroad in this land.

The spirituality of the German people as expressed in ecclesiastical art is apt to be disappointing. There is little of the pure emotional appeal; here we find a simple directness, a stability that is concerned with essentials.

Heidelberg was our first intimate visit to a German university. Almost barrack like in it appearances we were impressed with the contrast to our well appointed American seats of learning. A Bishop well known in these parts introduced us to the various phases of religious life. Here again were reflected the German characteristics; efficiency, directness, and simplicity, sometimes lacking the intimate personal touch.

At the university itself we were fortunate in hearing Professor Luttge, head of the department of Ethics. His lecture on the ethics of Christianity gave evidence of absolute confidence and a deep humility. We were struck by the absence of notes both on the part of this professor and students. Here it seemed learning was a natural thing, and honesty and freedom were essential prerequisites. Professor von Schubert lecturing on Church History, and known the world over gave, after one deciphered the German that was filtered through this excellent man's moustache the same impression of utter ease and freedom.

At the University of Berlin there came to us an unusual privilege. Here we were able to listen to men of international fame, although there are many differences concerning their conclusions. Having had some knowledge of these men through their books we were impressed by their manner and appearance in the class room.

Professor Adolf Harnack lecturing informally to a small group on the New Testament made us feel that here was a man sincere in everything he undertook. There was a charming manner about his way of presenting his subject. There was no attempt at forcing conclusions. His statements seemed to fall as suggestions to a vast store of what had gone before and had been contributed by other scholars. Whatever his personal beliefs he seemed to animate a simple faith.

Professor Seeberg, Sr., lecturing on the History of Dogma is a kindly gray haired man. We learned from some of his students that in his later years he was returning to a more positive approach in matters of doctrine. His son who also lectured, and who is creating an impression by his work is destined to take up when his father retires. The son is noted for his conservative manner and adherence to the Evangelical beliefs. The transition from father to son is an interesting one. Students of theology will do well to watch the work of the younger Seeberg.

The Introduction to Old Testament Theology was presented by Professor Sellin, a charming personality.

All these men we felt stressed the importance of seeking the fundamentals, and even though their life's work was about to close they gave evidence of a vitality that could only be maintained through constant open mindedness. Professor Sellin gave advance notice of a proposed trip to the Holy Land for the purpose of making additional excavations, and although a man nearing sixty-five he was as enthusiastic as a college boy about to perform his first experiment. Professor Lietzmann lecturing on the 13th chapter of Romans was a most pleasing revelation. Speaking distinctly and with much weight he gave an exegesis that at times reminded one of a simple sermon from the lips of a pious village pastor.

Our hurried and brief contacts came to an end. We felt the writings of these men sometimes tended to obscure their faith as one came to know it on actual contact. There came to our minds that whatever their opinions, much learning had not robbed them of a simple faith and a humble approach to the Word of God. We found in them much of the pioneering spirit that sought the truth, confident that the truth of the Word and the Spirit of God are not fixed in the past alone.

Wilmington, Delaware.

* * *

Our grand business undoubtedly is, not to see what lies dimly at a distance, but to do what lies clearly at hand.—*Carlisle.*

For Your Scrap Book

Reverend A. Wallace Copper, A.B.

Luminous and Electric Fish*

THERE is more life in the sea than land. In the great blue depths have been found fifty kinds of electric fish. Some have what appears to be lights along their sides and one specie has a long rod extending from the back of its head over the front of its nose and upon it is what appears to be a light.

The electric eel sends a shock out through the water which will knock down a beast of burden. It can kill an enemy by touching it with its head and tail at the same time. In the lower Nile and the rivers of tropical Africa is found a catfish about three feet long. It generates a current of four hundred and fifty volts which is enough to knock a man down.

A party of French naturalists were engaged in deep sea exploration. They dropped their dredge into a deep place in the ocean and brought up a load of shrub-shaped coral animals. They lighted the ship's laboratory to the extent that fine print could be read twenty feet away. As they died the light dimmed. These luminous fish have the power to generate electricity into light without heat. Man has never been able to do this, as much power is wasted in heat.

There is a type of fish that must remain at a certain depth in the ocean. If it rises too near the surface it will explode.

Jane Austen

IN the books of Jane Austen are no heroes and heroines, no intricate plots, no hair-raising adventure and no out-and-out rascals. In all her stories you cannot find an outstanding reprobate, convict or culprit; none of the riff-raff of the earth. There is nothing spicy, sensational, of sex or off color, and yet she has succeeded in writing some of the greatest stories in the English language. Her productions have been so remarkable that a man like the late Lord Beaconsfield, a writer of note, confessed he had read *Pride and Prejudice* seventeen times.

*The Story of Geology—Allan Benson.

Shedd on the Atonement

DR. SHEDD'S statement on the Atonement is most illuminating in view of the many loose and sentimental things that are being written and said today.

"A feeling of ill-desert necessitates an expiation in order to its extinction, as the burning sensation of thirst needs the cup of cold water, that it may be allayed. When the sense of guilt is awakened by the Spirit's operation, the soul craves the Atonement. When the soul feels consciously criminal before the Everlasting Judge, the difficulties that beset the doctrine of the cross all vanish in the craving of the conscience for acquittal through the substitutionary sufferings of the Son of God."

The Value of Money

HERE is an anonymous paragraph on the value of money that puts it exactly. "Money is an article that can be used as a universal passport to all parts of the world except heaven, and as a provider of everything except happiness."

Man's Ego-Mania

EVER since Adam objected to dependence upon God, and chose self-sufficiency, men have pursued the empty dream of self-sufficiency. One of the latest apostles of this Self Cult is Professor William P. Montague, identified with the department of philosophy at Columbia University. He is described in a news despatch from New Haven as a white-haired gentleman, 56 years of age, a philosophical thinker of international repute. He recently addressed Yale School of Religion. The account of his doctrine as it was published in the newspaper is as follows:

Religion must go. With the increasing perfection of life through man's own devices, religion, with its negations and compulsions and outgrown mythology is coming to seem unnecessary. Fear and sorrow which drove primitive man to the solace of a mystical belief, are no longer the themes of our more serious culture.

Achievement of the fullest, is the object of prometheanism, which derives its name from the legendary Greek Prometheus, who defied the gods and thus became a symbol of individualism, self-potentiality and will—the keynotes of the new faith.

This new religion of Professor Montague is not new. It is the recurring sin of the ages. Humanism, the worship of reason, Epicureanism, libertinism, the wild extravagances of Nietzsche are all of them expressions of the same self-drive of the human heart. Professor Montague's religion is only an illustration of the Biblical truth that the natural heart of man is depraved. When man's natural depravity is elevated into a religion, it inevitably takes some such form.

Handel

IN 1742 Handel personally led a great choral society of the city of Dublin in the first presentation of the *Messiah.* The crowd was so large that the men were requested not to wear swords or the ladies hoop-skirts. When the *Hallelujah Chorus* began with its mighty climax *King of Kings, Hallelujah,* King George, overcome with emotion, arose and remained standing until the end. The entire audience arose with him. That has been the custom ever since along the English countryside.

The father of Walter Damrosch introduced it in this country. Who of us, when that mighty climax began, have not arisen, in honor not merely of a great society, a great leader, a great composer, but of the King of Kings whose presence has been made real by sweet voices.—*My Musical Life*—Walter Damrosch.

* * *

An enormous amount of money is paid by people to get well, to quacks, thus depleting the private bank account. There are over 25,000 persons posing illegally as doctors of medicine in New York State alone. They are equipped with false diplomas which are purchased for about $200 apiece—*Rid the Country of Quacks.—H. T. Brindridge.*

Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA

IN THESE Sunday evenings looking toward Easter, it is the sincere desire of the Editor that the individual leaders will stress evangelism. We have been studying throughout the year great truths of the Bible, we have ordered our lives according to the ethical teaching of Jesus, but now we want to be sure not to miss the experimental power and blessing of the new birth and its resultant benefits to individual and social life. With this in view, we trust that every meeting may be conducted and planned in the spirit of prayer and with a passion of evangelism.

There are three books which are readable for any high school student. The first two of these the author heartily recommends, the third he refers to you as modern and unsatisfactory treatment of great doctrines. They are: *The Apostle's Creed,* by Harold Paul Sloan, *Things Most Surely Believed,* by Clarence Edward Macartney, and *Beliefs That Matter,* by William Adams Brown.

Topic for March 8, 1931

The Triumphal Entry of the King

Scripture: Matt. 21:1-17.

Introduction

GREAT processions have passed before each of us. Perhaps we have seen Lindbergh's triumphal return after his historic flight, perhaps we cheered the returning doughboys from France, perhaps through the pages of history we have lived with those who were thrilled at the return of Napoleon from his victorious campaigns, or our hearts may have leaped when reading of Caesar's entry to Rome. But there is no event which can yearly produce upon the consciousness of Christians the effect that the narrative of the Triumphal Entry of our King presents.

We see again the crowds, the slopes of Olivet, Bethany, then the lowly foal of an ass covered with garments of men, and upon it seated the Son of man. We hear the hosannas, we catch the perfume of the palms, we feel the cool breeze of the Mediterranean, and we are startled by the brilliant Oriental colors against a Judean sky. Why all this crowd? why the tumult? the hosannas? and the tears coursing down the cheeks of Him about Whom we are singing?

Yesterday a notable miracle had taken place—friend Lazarus was raised from the dead, the day before, lepers were cleansed and blind were made to see. Who would not rejoice with such a supernatural Personality entering Jerusalem as her King? Fourteen hundred years before this, an old man had bowed himself upon his staff in Egypt and said,

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Binding his foal unto the vine and his ass's colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes (Genesis 49:10-11).

So Solomon had ridden into Jerusalem and so had the people expected the king, of whose reign there should be no end, to ride into Jerusalem.

Jesus did this in full consciousness of what was about to happen.

(1) The suffering that He was to endure on Calvary did not come unexpectedly to Christ. At that supreme moment when Peter and the disciples rose to the realization of His Deity and confessed it at Caesarea-Philippi, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God," Jesus had turned to them and had begun to teach them that He must suffer many things of the elders and chief priest and scribes, and should be killed and be raised again the third day (Matt. 16:13-23).

Again at the Transfiguration there appeared to Him those two witnesses of God, Moses and Elijah, who talked with Him concerning His decease, that is, His exodus and His atonement. The glory of their exodus was not to be compared with His, since He was to accomplish the salvation of the race (Matt. 17:1-8).

And again when the disciples urged Him to refrain from going to Jerusalem at the death of Lazarus, they also saw that death was in store for Him. Thomas said, "Let us go with Him that we may also die with Him" (John 11:11-16).

(2) The tinge of sadness is given to that beautiful scene as Christ stopped before Jerusalem upon a slight mount and cried,

> O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that stonest the prophets and killest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thee unto Myself as a hen doth gather her brood, but ye would not . . . Thou knowest not the time of thy visitation (Luke 19:41-44).

Individuals lost their opportunity that day, a city's doom was sealed, and a nation had the axe laid to its roots. But if through the fall of them salvation has come to the world and if the diminishing of them be the riches of the Gentiles how much more shall their fullness be (Rom. 11:12). Humanly speaking it was sad, but from the throne view it was the accomplishment of world redemption.

(3) That coming death was a necessity. It existed in the plan of God. It was for that hour that Jesus came into the world. Why could not that cup have passed from Him? Only because there was no other way. Of what use are speculations about what would have happened if He had not died That alternative did not exist, although the responsibility that caused Him to die did exist.

Jesus knew that His Kingdom was not what the crowd thought it was.

(1) Their idea of the Kingdom was of a physical kingdom. Beyond the lake of Galilee they attempted to force Him to become a king. They wanted freedom from the Roman yoke. James and John wanted the seats upon His right and His left when He came into His Kingdom. And even as their ideas of His Kingdom were mistaken at His first Coming, so no doubt most of our ideas of the nature of His Kingdom shall be mistaken at His Second Coming.

(2) Jesus Himself clearly taught what that Kingdom was to be. In the parables (See Matt. 13) the spiritual nature of His Kingdom was emphasized. To Pilate He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." To James and John He announced that their baptism was to be the baptism of blood, and their cup to be the cup of suffering.

(3) The New Testament greatly enlarges this teaching of the nature of Christ's Kingdom. It was to be "the kingdom of righteousness and joy and peace in the Holy Ghost." That kingdom exists in three forms. It was formerly the Jewish nationalistic kingdom, or the church organization of the Old Testament. It is now the kingdom of the Spirit or the church organism of the New Testament. It will be the Eternal kingdom of perfect righteousness at the Second Coming of Christ. The Jews of that day mixed the three ideas of the kingdom.

Jesus knew at that time that He would be King over a great host.

(1) He was aware as He approached Jerusalem that He would be rejected. He had lived in the shadow of the Cross. Every temptation which He endured was in essence the temptation to abandon the Cross (Read Matt. 4:1-13; 16:23; 26:39).

(2) He was also aware that in that rejection was to be the birth of the Church. Even as the bride of Adam was taken from his side, so figuratively the Church bride of Christ was generated from His bleeding side.

With the timeless view Christ looked down through the centuries. He saw the loyal subjects of the first three centuries enduring martyrdom, suffering, and persecution. He saw Ignatius, Polycarp, Latimer, Tyndale, Rogers, Hincmar, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, and a host of modern devotees, who are also ready to lay down their lives in His cause. The Scriptures was fulfilled, for He saw the travail of His soul and was satisfied.

At the same time He looked to that ultimate form of the kingdom when righteousness should rule, from which sin should be exiled, and in which there should be joy and peace unspeakable.

Conclusion

That triumphal entry was the approach not only to His Cross, but also to His Coronation. It was His acceptance of His Kingdom. The sign on the Cross read, "The King of the Jews." He was a king and on that Cross He received the sceptre of His Kingdom.

(1) The vital and important question is, Have you become a citizen of that Kingdom? Have you been smugggled into it, have you been naturalized, or have you been freeborn with total rights of citizenship?

(2) The Jews rejected Him and His rule in spiritual power. Have you rejected His spiritual rule over your life?

(3) The mass of people today are even as the mass was in His day, ready to sing Hosannas to him on the road, to crucify Him on the rood. By your neglect or indifference are you causing Him to have died in vain?

We shall never see Him riding on a colt in humility to be broken, but we shall see Him as He stands with feet of brass upon the Mount of Olives as the Judge before Whom we shall be broken.

Questions

1. Was there any escape for Jesus from death? What should that death mean for us?
2. What is the nature of Christ's Kingdom today? What relationship has social service to this? And what relationship has individual salvation?
3. Will the church necessarily endure persecution

in this age? Of what advantage would such persecution be?

4. What should the meaning of Christ's triumphal entry be to us?

The Triumphal Entry of Christ

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
Hark! all the tribes Hosanna cry;
O Saviour meek, pursue thy road
With palms and scattered garments strowed.

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die:
O Christ, thy triumphs now begin
O'er captive death and conquered sin.

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
The winged squadrons of the sky
Look down with sad and wondering eyes
To see the approaching sacrifice.

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
Thy last and fiercest strife is nigh;
The Father, on his sapphire throne,
Expects his own annointed Son.

Ride on, ride on in majesty!
In lowly pomp ride on to die;
Bow thy meek head to mortal pain,
Then take, O God, thy power, and reign.
—Henry H. Milman.

Topic for March 15, 1931

The Last Supper

Scripture: John 13:1-38; Matt. 26:17-29; Matt. 14: 12-31.

Introduction

IN THE cathedral at Milan is kept Leonardo da Vinci's masterpiece called The Last Supper. It is a portrayal of the reactions caused upon the disciples by Christ's saying, "One of you shall betray me." The hands of each reveal the thoughts of the mind. And as we study those hands certain lessons are derived from them.

Certain events had transpired preceding this scene. Two strangely contrasting characters, that of an impetuous, assertive man, and that of a meditative, retiring lad, were carefully pursuing a water-carrier down the streets of Jerusalem. They stopped at his house and inquired of his master where he would that the great Master should celebrate the Passover. An upper room was assigned to them. It was a room saved for the use of Jesus. In it the Holy Ghost was destined to descend upon the early disciples, in it the Church was to meet after the Ascension, and in it Jesus Christ was to appear in His resurrected body. It was the Upper Room in the home of the mother of John Mark.

The time was the time of the Passover. Fourteen hundred years before, God through blood had saved Israel from the angel of destruction. The Passover was a memorial of that event and was a type of the great Event which should bring salvation to the world. Faith in that Passover was faith in the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. For this feast the strangely contrasted Peter and John were preparing, and soon, the lamb having been slain, the unleavened bread prepared, and the disciples gathered, the above-mentioned feast began.

At this celebration of the Covenant a number of startling events took place. These were:

A Lesson in Humility, and Service—for All

(1) In the midst of what ought to have been a peaceful, searching, spiritual season, strife was gendered among the disciples and this was over the cause of who should be greatest. Even to the end these disciples were filled with self and with unholy ambition. Yet Jesus loved them with the same boundless love with which He had led them for three years. He now knew that it was the time of His end.

The hour for which He had come into the world was approaching the stage. This was the time for Him to give them the greatest object lesson they were to receive. Rising from the table, at which all were reclining, He laid aside His mantle, girded Himself with a towel, and proceeded to wash the feet of the twelve. This was the most menial task that He could perform.

(2) Coming to Peter, the Foot-washer was rebuffed. "Lord, thou shalt never wash my feet." But alas, for he that is not washed has no part with Him. Why this necessity for foot-washing? It was because the feet of an individual are stained by the journeys of life. In those days the public bath was used, and yet before the individual reached home, the dust had gathered around the sandals and feet so that it was necessary to wash them again.

What a parable this was upon life! These had been washed entirely from their sins through their faith in Jesus Christ. But along the journey of life, self and pride and ambition and strife had clustered about their personalities and they had need to be washed afresh. Even so, every Christian who has once been washed from his sins needs to be daily forgiven and cleansed from the accretions of contacts in a sinful world.

(3) "Even as I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye ought to wash one another's feet." It is the Gentiles who want to be great in being served for this is their standard of greatness. It is not the standard of greatness for the Christian. His standard of greatness is that of service.

For the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many . . . He that is greatest among you, let him be as he that doth serve.

A Lesson in Loyalty—for Judas

(1) Whereas the group was rebuked for ambition, Judas is now rebuked for avarice. How startled this group must have been at the second announcement, "One of you shall betray me." The answers were flung forth, "Lord, is it I? is it I?" A traitor amongst those zealots! Impossible! Yet it is true. Even as among the heroes of Saratoga there was a traitor—Benedict Arnold—so among the devoted followers of Jesus Christ there was a Judas Iscariot.

(2) What a searching of motives now took place. No one thought of the other but each of himself. Every conscience laid bare before the reason and memory of each every false thought and hope that had been nursed through three years. "Lord, is it I?" Peter, reclining on the opposite side of the table from Christ, signalled to John, who leaned upon the Lord's breast, to ask who was to betray Him. The answer came clearly, to be understood later, but not then.

(3) "What thou doest, do quickly," and Judas arose and departed. "And it was night." Conscience had been strangled, loyalty had been crucified, friendship had been crushed, and it was night. Perhaps no night was so black as that night. We knew it was night because the Passover was celebrated at no other time. But it was the black night for the soul who walked out of that room and said "Goodby" to God.

The story is told of an incident that occurred at Princeton during the revival held there by George Whitefield. Aaron Burr had been greatly touched. That night he went to his room determining to settle the question of his relationship to God. During the darkness of that night a student, crossing the campus, heard the shutters of a window thrown open, saw the light of a lamp shine forth into the night, and heard a voice cry, "Goodby, God." That voice was the voice of Aaron Burr. "And it was night."

A Lesson in Long-suffering—for Peter

(1) The third rebuke is that to impulsiveness. Again the group had been startled by the statement that Jesus was going away and where He went they could not come. "Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake." Wonderful if true. But the Lord knew that it was not. "Peter, the cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice" (John 13:38).

How parallel this was to his two professions at Caesarea-Philippi. And yet how little he knew his own heart. The next day he was to deny his Christ three times, he was to stand among his enemies, and he was to weep bitterly as he realized the meaning of his action. "Peter, Satan hath desired thee to sift thee as wheat, but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not."

A Lesson in Faithfulness—John and Philip

(1) The last rebuke was the rebuke of sin. As Jesus had formerly said to the Jews that whither He went they could not come because of their sin, so now He tells the disciples the same, except that they knew the way. For Jesus had said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." Even yet Philip did not believe and needed to be reassured that in Christ he had seen the Father.

(2) The Way was not only clear but a Guide in the way, that is, the Comforter, should be sent. And though Jesus Himself went away the Comforter would abide with them forever (Read John 14:16-18; John 20:19-23; Acts 1:8).

Conclusion

The most important thing that took place during this hallowed hour was the institution of the Lord's Supper (Read Matt. 26:26-29). In the clearest of language Jesus here sets forth the meaning of His death. That death was to be a substitutionary atonement for the sins of men in satisfaction of the laws of Divine justice. He died for us, that we might have Life in and through Him. Every time we commemorate the Lord's Supper we preach the gospel of His death for our sins.

Through those wonderful symbols the Christian Church has been kept close to Him through centuries. The Old Testament Passover was now abrogated for it was fulfilled in the Lamb of God, the New Testament Eucharist or Lord's Supper was instituted in its place. The Passover looked forward to Calvary as well as backward to the exodus, the Lord's Supper looked backward to Calvary as well as forward to the Second Coming.

Questions

1. After you have read Exodus 12, state your opinions on the meaning of the passover. Is the Lord's Supper the same as this?

2. Can you think of any additional lessons to be derived from the Last Supper in the *Upper room.*

3. What relation has the New Birth to the symbols of communion?

The Last Supper

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

According to thy gracious word,
In meek humility,
This will I do, my dying Lord,
I will remember thee.

Thy body broken for my sake,
My bread from heaven shall be;
Thy testamental cup I take,
And thus remember thee?

Gethsemane can I forget,
Or there thy conflict see,
Thine agony and bloody sweat,
And not remember thee?

When to the cross I turn mine eyes,
And rest on Calvary,
O lamb of God, my Sacrifice,
I must remember thee!

Remember thee, and all thy pains,
And all thy love to me;
Yea, while a breath, a pulse remains,
Will I remember thee!

And when these failing lips grow dumb,
And mind and memory flee,
When thou shalt in thy kingdom come,
Then, Lord, remember me!
—James Montgomery.

Topic for March 22, 1931

Gethsemane's Chalice

Scripture: Matt. 26:36-46.

Introduction

GETHSEMANE! Gethsemane! The place of my Saviour's agony! How the words ring in our ears. Hoffman's picture of Christ in Gethsemane is one of the most universally admired and inspiring pieces of art, and yet in one feature it fails. We see the thorns, the thunderclouds, the sleeping disciples, the rugged rocks of the Judean hill, the far off lights of Jerusalem, and the approaching lights of the traitorous Judas and the mob. Truly it is a picture of a place of agony.

But the Scripture says that He went a little farther and He fell on His face. That He went farther than all others and practiced as well as preached a religion of the greater price is seen by Hoffman and all. That He spent many nights in prayer is quickly grasped from a hasty reading of the Gospels.

But the manner of His prayer is often missed. He fell on His face. He could not stand, He could not kneel even with the help of a rock, but He fell in utter prostration. The prince of this world was trying Him for the last time. The forces of darkness had gathered in lowering clouds and looming blackness about Him. And in that most lonely hour He lifted to His lips the chalice of God, and tasted what on the morrow He must drain to the dregs.

The Cup That Was Offered

(1) This Cup consisted of the most terrific temptation that Jesus had ever endured. It is well to remember that the Personality of Jesus was constructed of two natures—the nature of man and the

nature of God. As God Christ could not be tempted; as man He could. This great mystery sometimes baffles the mind, for someone says, "If Christ were God, He could not sin, then how could He be tempted?" Metaphysically, that is, in relation to His being, He could not sin, but morally, in relation to His human nature, He could be tempted.

To experience the difference between right and wrong is obtained by resisting sin when in temptation. It is not necessary that man should fall into sin to know sin. Otherwise we would have to say that Adam had to sin to know the difference between right and wrong. Temptation is not sin.

(2) Listen to the prayer concerning that Cup. "O, my Father." What communion! God, the Father, was there with Him. The story is told of a man who was compelled to chasten his son. He told him that if he did a certain thing he must sleep in the attic alone for three nights. After the boy had been up in the dark loft for several hours of the first night, and the father and mother were tossing sleeplessly upon the bed, the man rose quietly and went up into the attic. He slipped noiselessly across the floor to the side of his son. There he beheld him with wide eyes, fearful in the dark. "Daddy could not let you come down," he said, "but he could not stand your being here alone, so he came up to stay with you." And for three nights the boy slept in his father's arms in the loft. This may help us a little to understand how God was with Jesus in the Garden.

"If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." The man was speaking here. It was our representative. Couldn't there be some other way, other than the Cross, other than the separation from God? Isn't something else possible? No, this is the only way. Then why speculate on the possibility of the Jews having not crucified Christ, and what would have happened, had He been accepted. This had to be. The law that had to be satisfied was the law of the nature of Christ or of God. He could not violate that law, for it was the law of His Being—the law of justice.

Herein lies the weakness of Islam. It tries to throw law to the four winds and say that God can arbitrarily forgive the sins of men. This cannot be done without a satisfying Atonement. There was and is no other way.

The Contents of the Cup

(1) Into the contents of that Cup came sorrow for the sins of the world. There is an erroneous view sometimes held that Jesus made Atonement in that He offered up to God a perfect sorrow for sin. That He offered up this sorrow is true, but sorrow never atones for sin. For there are two kinds of sorrow, one is remorse and one is contrition. The wicked sinner who hates God often experiences remorse after his deeds. Judas had remorse, and he went and hanged himself. Remorse will never save.

A truly regenerated heart experiences contrition after sin. When Peter denied his Lord, he went out and wept bitterly. His heart was full of grief. Without this contrition there can be no forgiveness, but at the same time contrition does not satisfy the law of God. In the Garden Jesus gave a complete repentance and contrition for the sins of the world with which He was identified at His baptism. It was this sorrow for the sin of others which broke His heart. "His soul was sorrowful unto death."

(2) In that Cup was cast all the suffering of the world. Physical pain was there, which was to be fully endured on the morrow—the thorns, the scourge, the nails, and the rood. Rejected love was there. He was Love Incarnate and yet was rejected in hate. Loneliness was there. The Scripture says that He was homesick—homesick for Heaven, after an absence of thirty-three years.

Poverty was there; "For our sakes He became poor." Social ostracism was there, "He was a friend of sinners." Class consciousness was there, He was "a carpenter's son." Spiritual struggle was there, Hell yawned on Him. There was no suffering which He did not know. He was made sin for us, and as Peter says, "He bore our sins in His own body on the tree."

Consecration to the Cup

(1) We here get the picture of a human being in perfect accord with the Divine, "Not as I will, but as Thou wilt." The last temptation to flee the Cross was conquered. He never wavered again. Self was completely and absolutely surrendered. What He has done, He expects us to do. This is the religion of the greater price, that which goes farther, perhaps only a little, but farther than all the rest.

(2) The process of consecration was gradual. Three times He came to the disciples to gain strength through prayer fellowship, and three times He returned to His lonely struggle. What a truth He might have communicated to these sleeping saints that night. And yet how often He finds us in the same attitude today. Sadly He looked at them, sadly He awakened them, and sadly He rebuked them.

And with the same emotion He beholds a moribund church today. "Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation." They failed to watch and they fell, and it is well for us to remember that the first step in their fall was taken in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Conclusion

This time His prayer looked to the end, "If it be Thy will that I drink it, I will." Angels strengthened Him. The Power was received to tread the winepress alone. It was a voluntary death, they took not His life from Him. He laid it down of Himself, for when Judas and the mob came, at one word from Him they fell as dead men to the earth. In one moment at His word they might have been exterminated. For us He was giving His life. What have we given for Him?

Questions

1. After you have studied Hoffman's picture of Christ in Gethsemane, what would you detract from or add to it?
2. Have you ever experienced loneliness in prayer, or the urge to pray in lonely hours?
3. When we endure suffering in our lives, what ought we to remember about the cup of Christ?
4. What does the prayer, "let my will be lost in thine," mean to a Christian?

Gethsemane's Chalice

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

'Tis midnight; and on Olives' brow
The star is dimmed that lately shone;
'Tis midnight; in the garden now,
The suffering Saviour prays alone.

'Tis midnight; and from all removed,
The Saviour wrestles lone with fears;

E'en that disciple whom he loved
Heeds not his Master's grief and tears.

'Tis midnight; and for others' guilt
The Man of sorrows weeps in blood;
Yet he that hath in anguish knelt
Is not forsaken by his God.

'Tis midnight; and from ether-plains
Is borne the song that angels know;
Unheard by mortals are the strains
That sweetly soothe the Saviour's woe.
—William B. Tappan.

Topic for March 29, 1931

The Resurrection

Scripture: 1 Cor. 15:1-11; Acts 1:3.

THE most important historical words ever written are those referred to in our Scripture. No poems of Virgil, Dante, or Milton, no decree of Thutmos, Hammurabi, Caesar, or Napoleon, no thesis of Seneca, Voltaire, or Shaw, is comparable with these in either meaning or effect. Scripturally, there is no Old Testament promise or prophecy and no New Testament comfort or news that can be classed with these. They are the most important because they are the first records of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. And it might be interesting to note that they were written in disproof of error.

Many people are saying today that polemics have no place in the pulpit, but these forensic words have proved themselves to be some of the most important in all the Scripture. They were not written to prove the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; this was an accepted fact appealed to in producing proof for the Resurrection of the body of the believer. In so appealing the writer refers to the Gospel preached by him and accepted by them at his first coming to Corinth. And they were written in 55 A. D. only twenty years after the Resurrection of Christ. How soon and how universal was the acceptance of Christ's Resurrection as the basis for Christian truth! This truth was first not only in the order of presentation in Paul's preaching, but was also first in importance.

The New Testament evidence for this Resurrection is twofold;

The Open Tomb

(1) The open tomb is the best attested fact of history. It is attested by psychological, logical, and historical evidence. The burial of Jesus was a bombshell dropped amid the hosts of the disciples. They had expected a king, an emancipator, a deliverer—they had a corpse. On the Resurrection morning, Peter and John were in bed. On the Resurrection afternoon, Cleophas and his friend turned their faces toward their ancestral dwellings. On the Resurrection evening, a disciples' council was held to determine the course of their retreat. The hopes of all were blasted, the expectations frustrated, and the movement dissipated.

Now there is a sudden change. The withered frame of the disciples' group feels again the pulsation of life; joy, excitement, and wonder grip them. They go from place to place holding meetings, they soon begin to preach, and they startle the Jerusalem multitudes into listening to their message. What could have caused this change? What instilled into them the new dynamic? Whence the new impetus? There is only one answer—Christ had risen from the dead.

No group could pick themselves up by their own bootstraps, and drive themselves into action by the whip of their own conscience if such an event had not taken place. Psychologically, the actions of the disciples can be explained in no other way.

(2) Logically, the tomb must have been open and the body gone. If it were not, certainly some of the disciples would have been honest enough and have had sense enough to have investigated the tomb to see if the body were there. What is more, if the disciples had not, the enemies of Jesus certainly would have done so. They only had to produce the body and the bubble of excitement would have burst. Why did they not produce the body? Simply because it could not be produced.

(3) Historically, the risen Christ was seen by different individuals at eleven different times. When the record was written and spread abroad many of those individuals were still alive. If they had not so seen the risen Christ, they would have disproved the allegation.

We have more proof for the historical truth of the records stating these facts than we have for any other document within three hundred years of that period. If we cannot depend upon this as true, we cannot say that anything commonly accepted as known in that period is true.

When these proofs are taken in connection with the theistic belief in God, that is, that He has created and upholds by His Sovereign power the Universe, they are irrefutable.

The Appearances of the Resurrected Christ

(1) These appearances are not hallucinations. An hallucination is a pathological experience to which nothing corresponds in reality. By a bump on the head, one may see stars, when in reality no stars are shining. The optic nerve has simply been stimulated by some undue pressure. Now if Christianity is due to some such phenomenon, then all we can say is that a very worthy institution has been founded on false and unworthy causes. It would then be unworthy of our acceptance.

(2) These appearances are represented by the historical narratives as being actual, visible, presentations of Christ. He is pictured as walking, talking, eating, and drinking with the disciples. The intercourse is not momentary but extended. And by common agreement among psychologists an hallucination is a momentary phenomenon. These Resurrection appearances could not have been such subjective phenomena.

(3) Eleven appearances are recorded in the Scripture. They are: to the women on the first day of the week (Luke 24); to Mary alone, as she tarried behind (John 20 and Mark 13); to Simon Peter alone (Luke 24:24; 1 Cor. 15:5); to Cleophas on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24); to the disciples behind closed doors (John 20); to the disciples in the same place one week later—Thomas present (John 20); to the disciples on a mount in Galilee—probably when five hundred were present (Matt. 28:18; 1 Cor. 15:6); to the disciples by the sea of Galilee (John 21); on the road to Bethany as Jesus was taken up (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:11); to James the brother of the Lord (1 Cor. 15:7); and to Paul on the Damascus road (Acts 9; Acts 22; Acts 26).

If this event did not happen there can be no attested fact of history. It resolves into this position. We must accept the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as an historic fact or adopt skepticism as our ultimate

philosophy of life. When we study the results throughout the centuries of the faith in the Resurrection we know that there must be an undeniable truth in it which martyrdom, persecution, and suffering have failed to snuff out.

Conclusion

The wonderful result of the truth of this doctrine is that Christianity is true objectively. That is, though we cannot prove the Virgin Birth, or the translation of Enoch, yet we can prove the Resurrection, and in the Resurrection the supernatural has entered the natural. Once this is admitted and proved, there is no difficulty in admitting of all the rest.

The second result is that our faith is not in vain, that is, through faith we are risen with Christ in righteousness to a new life. And finally we have definite assurance, in that Christ rose from the dead, that we also shall be raised bodily from the dead. As He is the first fruits so we shall be the full fruit. The Son of righteousness has risen with healing in His wings.

Questions

1. Do you believe and accept the Resurrection of Christ to be an historic fact? What ought this to mean to you?
2. Does the Resurrection explain the possibility of miracles and of Revelation to you?
3. What are the practical results of the Resurrection in our lives?
4. Does this Easter season mean any more to you than any other season?

Resurrection

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

Our Lord is risen from the dead;
Our Jesus is gone up on high;
The powers of hell are captive led,
Dragged to the portals of the sky:
There his triumphal chariot waits,
And angels chant the solemn lay:
"Lift up your heads, ye heavenly gates;
Ye everlasting doors, give way!"

"Loose all your bars of massy light,
And wide unfold the ethereal scene;
He claims these mansions as his right;
Receive the King of glory in!"
"Who is the King of glory? Who?"
"The Lord, that all our foes o'ercame;
The world, sin, death, and hell o'erthrew;
And Jesus is the Conqueror's name."

Lo, his triumphal chariot waits,
And angels chant the solemn lay:
"Lift up your heads, ye heavenly gates;
Ye everlasting doors, give way!"
"Who is the King of glory? Who?"
"The Lord, of glorious power possessed;
The King of saints and angels too;
God over all, forever blest!"

—Charles Wesley.

Topic for April 5, 1931

The Ascension

Scripture: Acts 1:1-11; Luke 24:49-53.

Introduction

MOUNTAINS and clouds are inextricably connected with our memory of Christ's visit to earth. At the Transfiguration He was enveloped with a cloud upon the mountain, at the Baptism a Voice spoke out of the cloud, in Gethsemane dark clouds seemed to touch the mountain, and now a bright cloud and angelic figures dim the eyes as they follow Him ascending. "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

For most people the question as to what is the center of the Universe has never been satisfactorily answered. It was once thought that the earth was the center, it was then thought that the sun was the center, and now it is not known what is the center. But that all movement is either centrifugal or centripetal is certain.

Concerning this a new book has recently been published called *Calvinism and the Philosophy of Nature* in which Alexander Hepp advances the thesis that Heaven is the center of the Universe. Why should this not be true? Certainly we have as much right to think so as to accept any other theory. When one meditates upon the Ascension of Jesus and the proximity of the angelic hosts he is sometimes led to consider such a thesis.

Christ Tarried on Earth for Forty Days After His Bodily Resurrection

(1) As the disciples stood there watching Him ascend, and then scanned the heavens after He was gone, they were told by two angels to stop gazing into the heavens, implying that they should go and become active. There was no need for watching the heavens then. That same Jesus which was taken up from them would come in like manner. That fact was assured. The present obligation was action.

Life had been quite uneven for the disciples since the Resurrection. They didn't know when or where they would see the Lord next. Once they had seen Him while they were fishing, several times while they were eating, and again while they were walking. It was rather hard to tell when He might appear again.

But now they knew that He would not come again until He came to permanently remain and to judge the world in righteousness and in truth. While He was gone, it was their duty to carry on His work with steadfastness and vigor.

(2) The reason for Christ's delay on earth after His Resurrection was that He might finish His work. He had to instruct these followers concerning His new dispensation. The times have now changed. They were no longer to minister only to the Jews, but were to go to the uttermost parts of the world.

They were to wait before they went for the empowering of the Holy Ghost. In order to receive this empowering they had to be gathered together from Galilee and from Judea and from Peraea into one place where the historic baptism of the Spirit should take place. This had a twofold bearing upon them. It would give them the presence of God within them, and the power of God upon them.

Christ Ascended Visibly Into Heaven

(1) It is certain that Christ went to a definite place. His body can only be in one place at one time, it is His glorified humanity and is not ubiquitous. Peter says, "that he was by the right hand of God exalted, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this" (Acts 2:33). We do not know where He is, but we know that there must be a place for the body.

This is the reason that the Holy Ghost is the agent who is working in the world today. Both natures of Christ are there, His humanity, glorified, and His Deity. The latter is omnipresent, the former is not.

(2) Christ went to Heaven with a definite purpose, to intercede as high priest in behalf of Christians. John says, "if any man sin, we have an ad-

vocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the Righteous" (1 John 2:1).

Herein lies one of the most precious truths for the Christian life, that is, that the Old Testament order of Aaronic priesthood has been done away and that the order of Melchisedec has superseded it. There is now no need for a human priest to come between us and God, for our High Priest is Jesus Christ Himself. The veil of the temple that formerly separated the believer from the Holy of Holies has been rent in twain. And we are now "a royal priesthood," able to intercede at any time and in any place directly with Deity. This precious truth is called the priesthood of the believer.

While on earth Christ was prophet, delivering unto us His precepts and example, while in Heaven Christ is Priest, interceding for the saints, and when He returns again it will be as King of Righteousness. Nevertheless it is also true that Christ has been, is, and will be King in the spiritual realm.

Christ Will Come Again Visibly to Judge the Earth

(1) The question whether Christ will come again has been answered in a number of different ways. Some have said that John 14:3, where Jesus says that He will come again to receive us unto Himself, refers to death, and that this is the Second Coming. Others have said that the Second Coming consisted in one's conversion. However, the passage for our study today clearly states that, "as ye have seen Him go into Heaven, Jesus shall come in like manner" (Acts 1:11).

Just as much as the Ascension was a visible ascension so the return will be a visible return. As the writer of Hebrews says, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9:28).

(2) As to the time of this visible return, two different strains treating of it run through the Bible. The first deals with those things which must be fulfilled before He comes, that is, the Gospel must be preached to all nations, the Jews must have returned nationally to Palestine, and the apostasy must reign in the Church (2 Thess. 2).

The second strain deals with the imminence of the Coming, that is, that He shall come "in such an hour as ye think not," "in the twinkling of an eye," "one shall be taken and one shall be left," "as a thief in the night."

Three things are certain, that Christ may come at any time, that He will come personally, and that He will come to judge the world.

(3) The purpose of Christ's Coming is very evident. It is to set right those things which are wrong, it is the ultimate triumph of good over evil. "The sheep shall be set on the right and the goats on the left." The book shall be opened, and each man shall be judged according to the deeds done in the body. The last thing confessed here, or unconfessed, will be the first thing to be confessed there.

Conclusion

Jesus came and lived a perfect life that He might yield a perfect obedience to God, and He died that He might satisfy the laws of God in our behalf. Jesus ascended to Heaven and was exalted to the right hand of God in glory to intercede in our behalf.

Jesus will come again as King of Righteousness and Judge of the earth to inaugurate an eternal Kingdom of goodness for the perfect expression of redeemed humanity. *Ride* on, thou King of glory, "in thy majesty, ride prosperously because of truth and of meekness and righteousness."

Questions

1. As we compare the Ascension of Christ with His birth, baptism, transfiguration, and trials, what place do clouds have?

2. Are we living now as though Christ were king of our lives? What does it mean to be under the dominion of a king?

3. Do you expect Christ to come again? How? When? Where? What for?

4 After you have read 1 Thess. 5:23, make up your mind as to the value of the teaching about the Second Coming.

Ascension

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

He is gone; a cloud of light
Has received him from our sight;
High in heaven, where eye of men
Follows not, nor angels' ken;
Through the veils of time and space,
Passed into the holiest place;
All the toil, and sorrow done,
All the battle fought and won.

He is gone; towards their goal
World and church must onward roll:
Far behind we leave the past;
Forward are our glances cast:
Still his words before us range
Through the ages, as they change:
Wheresoe'er the truth shall lead,
He will give whate'er we need.

He is gone; but we once more
Shall behold him as before;
In the heaven of heavens the same,
As on earth he went and came.
In the many mans'ions there,
Place for us he will prepare:
In that world unseen, unknown,
He and we shall yet be one.

—Arthur P. Stanley.

* * *

YOU

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

You are the fellow that has to decide
Whether you'll do it or cast it aside.
You are the fellow who makes up your mind
Whether you'll try for the goal that's afar
Or be contented to stay where you are.
Take it or leave it. Here's something to do!
Just think it over. It's all up to you!

What do you wish? To be known as a shirk,
Known as a good man who's willing to work.
Scorned for a loafer or praised by your chief.
Rich man or poor man or beggar or thief?
Eager or earnest or dull through the day,
Honest or crooked? It's you who must say!
You must decide in the face of the test
Whether you'll shirk it or give it your best.

Nobody here will compel you to rise;
No one will force you to open your eyes;
No one will answer for you yes or no,
Whether to stay there or whether to go.
Life is a game, but it's you who must say,
Whether as cheat or as sportsman you'll play.
Fate may betray you but you settle first
Whether to live to your best or your worst.

So whatever it is you are wanting to be,
Remember, to fashion the choice you are free.
Kindly or selfish, or gentle or strong,
Keeping the right way or taking the wrong,
Careless of honor or guarding your pride,
All these are questions which you must decide.
Yours the selection, whichever you do;
The thing men call character's all up to you!

—Edgar A. Guest.

Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M.,D.D.

Pathways to Certainty

THE suggestive title of Dr. William Adams Brown's book is *Pathways to Certainty,* published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. It is an arresting title. Nothing could be more desirable in this age of doubt, ferment and confusion than to discover the sure pathway to religious certainty. Therefore, this book will, no doubt, be hailed with keen anticipation and read with avidity. Will it accomplish the purpose for which it was written?

Any book by Dr. Brown will be, by that very token, instructive and distinctive. He reads widely and thinks deeply, and thus brings much information to your door. He challenges thought at every point, and that has its value. He leads you far afield and over vast territories, and that is intellectually helpful and inspiring to the reader. In this book he gives some real help to thinking and earnest skeptics as to the methods by which they may obtain at least a measure of inner assurance. His discussion as to the method and sources of knowledge (epistemology) indicates that there are some things that men may really know, so that they need not grope about in absolute darkness.

And what are "the pathways to certainty" which our author depicts so eruditely and graphically? They are four: 1. The Way of Authority; 2. The Way of Intuition; 3. The Way of Reason; 4. The Way of Experiment. Other chapters are entitled, "Why We Need Certainty in Religion;" "Ways of Reaching Certainty; "The Certainty of Today and the Hope for Tomorrow." These are suggestive chapter-headings, and seem to promise much aid in the quest for religious truth.

What is the chief merit of this interesting volume? It is that Dr. Brown, well known as a scholar and a thinker, really believes that the earnest doubter may find inner certitude regarding God's existence and beneficence and regarding Jesus Christ as the highest representative of God and the world's greatest and best religious example and teacher. Some people think that this teaching is of doubtful value; that it may lead people into a blind alley, after all; but our hope is that the honest skeptics of the day, having confidence in Dr. Brown's knowledge and acumen, may follow him as far as he goes, and then go on further and find the *real* way to religious certitude.

But some things must needs be said about Dr. Brown's several "pathways to certainty." First, he deals with the way of authority. The three authorities he sets forth are the Bible, the church and Jesus.

Now we doubt very much whether anybody has ever found actual inner assurance of truth by the way of authority. By giving up thinking and by being over-easily satisfied, he may gain a kind of peace in submitting to authority. But even to accept the Bible merely as authority would not give inner certainty, and would be a blind way of submitting to it. The assertion of authority may lead people to give attention to its claims and to try to find out on what grounds it is made, and thus may lead on the way to assurance; but in and of itself authority can do little, and it may do a lot of harm. We are somewhat surprised that Dr. Brown should even cite the church as an "authority." Had he simply said that the corporate witness of the whole Christian church to the truth of the Bible and Christianity ought to give the skeptic pause, and cause him to feel that the Christian religion is not something to be cast lightly aside, he would have been traveling, we think, on safe ground.

Our author treats of "Reasoning" as one of the pathways to certainty. This thesis is developed with great fullness. We do not think that the author means to teach that human reason can of itself lead to religious certainty, but simply that difficulties in the way may sometimes — perhaps often — be removed for the doubter by a reasoning process. And in this position we agree. For example, take the theistic arguments when set forth at their best:

they surely ought to convince the skeptic who is sincere that they are rational and lead to the conclusion that the doctrine of a personal God is the only adequate explanation of all the diversified phenomena of the universe, including self-conscious personalities, with a moral nature, a religious intuition, and a sense of qualitative values. Materialism and mechanism surely cannot account for these higher evaluations and experiences.

However, such reasoning cannot give certitude; cannot cause a man to say, "I *know* there is a God." They can only convince him that the theistic world-view is the most *reasonable* world-view. He still might say, "It seems to be reasonable, but I wish I *knew* whether it is true." Therefore something more is needed to give inner assurance of the truth of theism. The same kind of reasoning might be employed regarding the Christian world-view as set forth in the Bible.

The pathway called "intuition" is elaborately discussed in this volume. Here the author treats of mysticism, or what is known as "immediacy," or "meeting God face to face." He rightly shows both the truth and the error in mysticism. It often leads to false illuminism, and to fanaticism, and is too individualistic, and often lacks permanency. So frequently the mystic speaks of experiences that he cannot describe to others, and thus seems to talk in an unknown tongue, if he can express himself at all.

But we fear the author is not sufficiently thorough-going on this point. He fails to point out that a mystical experience which does not depend upon, and is not in accordance with, the Word of God is very dangerous, landing finally in either false enthusiasm or proud rationalism. Here he might have quoted from the Bible—only, strangely enough, he quotes from the Book of books very rarely. He might have referred to 1 Pet. 1:23: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." Yes, true Christian regeneration, giving inward certainty, comes by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God.

The last pathway named by our author is that of "experiment." We confess that we feel like balking at the use of this word "experiment" in this context. We doubt very much whether anybody would arrive at Christian certitude by "experimenting" with God. He surely would not if his motive were only curiosity, or even if his purpose was merely that of a scientist in the physical or chemical laboratory. If, however, Dr. Brown had gone deeper into this part of his subject and had said that every person who will go to God in the Biblical way will realize a witnessing response in his soul from Him, we might be willing to say that the certainty of religious truth is found by "experimentation." But such experimenting must be done humbly and earnestly; yea, with the most sincere desire for the truth.

Much as we dislike to say it, we feel that Dr. Brown has failed to point out clearly and simply the true Biblical pathway to certainty in religion. He has departed "from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3). After all, there is only one way—the way of Christian experience. One must know for oneself, and not for another, that God is the loving and redeeming God portrayed in the Bible. Even to read it in the Bible is not enough. The gospel of Christ must be written in the heart.

And how is this vital experience gotten? There is only one way. Other things may help to bring the doubter to the place where assurance may be found, but they cannot speak the final word of assurance. That must come through the *new birth*. "Verily I say unto thee, Except any one be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." So said the incarnate Son of God. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Why did not Dr. Brown quote these relevant passages of Scripture, not as "authority," in the minatory sense of the term, but to show, in a kindly and gentle way, that the Bible tells us just how certitude may be won, namely, by the way of the birth from above by the Holy Spirit, through the teaching of the Word of God? Why in his whole book did he quote only a few verses from the Bible, when there are so many that are apropos? He certainly quotes enough passages from human authors; but so few from the real Source Book of religious certification and truth. One would think that any person who is familiar with the Bible, and loves the Bible above all other books, would almost involuntarily quote from its pages in dealing with Christian assurance.

Perhaps the reader is asking whether we have even yet probed to the heart of our problem. He is right in raising that question. A further step must be taken. We have said that assurance comes through the experience of the new birth. But the *crux* of our inquiry is, How is the new birth to be gotten? This brings us to direct grips with our problem of Christian certification.

Here we quote a passage from Christ Himself—one that is quoted twice by Dr. Brown, but which he fails to treat with sufficient spiritual depth and acumen. It is this: "My teaching is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God or whether I speak from myself" (John 7:16, 17; American Revision). Observe: "If any man is willing to do His will, he shall *know* of the teaching." Here is a positive declaration that there *is* a pathway to certainty. Let the doubtful person try it in all earnestness and humility, and see what the result will be.

But, at this point in the inquirer's search for truth, what *is* the will of God? This is our most crucial and fundamental question. Dr. Brown replies: " It is through action that assurance must be won" (pp. 275). Oh, no! no! that is the old Catholic way of salvation by works, by the deeds of the law. Both Paul and Luther tried that method in vain. At this crucial juncture it is the will of God that the inquirer should *pray,* not work, nor try to *work up* an experience. The relevant directions here are Christ's blessed words: "Ask, and it shall be given unto you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened (Matt. 7:7, 8; read on through verse 11). Thousands upon thousands of people have trodden along this pathway, and when they have been truly in earnest in their quest, they have received the inner assurance of truth; yes, and of pardon and salvation in addition. "Behold, he prayeth," was said of Paul up there in Damascus, and it was not long before the scales fell from both his physical and his spiritual eyes, and he saw clearly. He could then say, "I know that the teaching is from God."

Perhaps assurance of truth, pardon and salvation may not come immediately in answer to prayer. Indeed, for good reasons God may withhold the answer for a time. It is His will that the inquirer should be humble, earnest, penitent (for all men are sinners and should recognize that fact), willing to believe on Christ as the Redeemer of the world, even as He declares Himself to be. If the seeker cannot believe, let him pray for faith, because fundamentally faith is "the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8.) When full surrender is made to God for the sake of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit will beget a new spiritual life in the soul and bear His witness of the truth in the inquirer's consciousness. He who is "the spirit of truth" will ever impart the assurance of truth.

We would emphasize the witness of the Holy Spirit. This is a clear Biblical fact, but Dr. Brown never refers to it as the pathway to certainty. Why not? Hear the clarion note of the Apostle Paul: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ" (Rom. 8:16, 17). This inner testimony of the Holy Spirit comes to the soul in regeneration and then continues that blessed function in progressive sanctification. It is a prescious perduring experience. In every respect, too, this inner witness of the Spirit agrees with the teaching of the Bible, because the Holy Spirit uses the Bible to bring it to pass.

There are many passages of Scripture which assure us that this experience of truth and pardon is obtainable under the divinely appointed conditions. For example: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 31, 32). Here is a classical passage that might be quoted to the skeptic. If the absolutely clear experience does not come at once, it will come by continuance in the school of Christ, which is the school of prayer, humility, repentance, obedience and receptivity. Then note these enlightening words: "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son: He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself" (1 John 5:9, 10). No less assuring are these words: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1). Here is another clear statement of inner assurance: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (1 John 3:14).

Verily the *Biblical* rubric is the only way to religious certainty—the way of prayer, humil-

ity, repentance, receptivity and surrender to God in the name of Jesus Christ. And what are the main contents of this Christian certification? They are at least the following: assurance that God exists and that He loves us; that the Bible is the true Word of God; that Christ is the way, the truth and the life; that sins are cancelled and their defilement cleansed away, and that believers are the children of God by a new birth. It means just what the inspired writer says: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor.5:17).

Withal, let it be remembered that a Christian experience does not make the Bible and its precious doctrines true. They are true whether men have the said experience or not. But this experience does this: it verifies to the individual believer the truthfulness and divine character of the Bible. The Holy Spirit in the heart witnesses to the veracity of the Word. The sun shines whether you can see its light or not. When your sight is restored, then you know for yourself that it exists and is shining. So with the Bible and its wonderful doctrines—*L.S.K.*

Reviews of Recent Books

The Karl Barth Theology. By Alvin S. Zerbe, Ph.D.,D.D. Central Publishing House, 2969-75 West 25th Street, Cleveland, Ohio. Price, $2.25.

If you want to do some "tall" thinking—perhaps we would better say profound thinking—get and read this book. If the Barthian theology can be made clear, it is clarified in this momentous volume. So much has been said and written about the theology of Barth, Brunner, *et al.*, that people who want to be theologically informed should peruse this deeply analytical book. Dr. Zerbe commends what is good in this species of theological speculation, especially its emphasis on God as the Sovereign of the universe and on the doctrine of salvation by pure grace. However, it is a regimen of paradoxes, which often seem to amount to contradictions. Keenly does Dr. Zerbe analyze the "Barthian Dualisms." The "cosmic-eschatological dualism," the chasm between God and man, faith and knowledge, the Bible as "the fallible word of man" and "the infallible Word of God," between time and eternity, between finity and infinity. God is the unknown God, and apparently unknowable. Even when He reveals Himself in the Bible and in Christ, He is still unknown; in fact, the mystery is only deepened, especially in God's revelation in the incarnation. To our mind, this last antithesis could be quite easily resolved by saying that we can *apprehend* God, but we cannot *comprehend* Him. That is what Paul means when he says, "Now we see through a glass darkly." A fundamental principle of Barthianism is this: *Finitum non capax infiniti* (the finite has no capacity for the Infinite). Evidently this is wrong. If it were true, we finite beings never could even think of the infinite. Here again the difficulty seems to us to be resolved by saying that finite man can apprehend, but cannot comprehend, the Infinite. Moreover, if the Infinite one could not relate Himself and reveal Himself to the finite, He would not be infinite; He would have a fatal limitation. The Barthians do not stand solid on the inspiration of the Bible, but yield too much to the rationalistic Biblical criticism; and such supineness is entirely unnecessary. What is Barthianism? It is a highly speculative philosophical method of theologizing. It is not "the simplicity which is in Christ." But get and read Dr. Zerbe's treatise; it is very much worth while both as an appreciation and a critique. He calls the Barthian theology "The New Transcendentalism." Often it is known as "The Theology of Crisis."

The Fundamental Principle of Calvinism. By H. Henry Meeter, Th.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 234 Pearl Street, N. W., Grand Rapids, Mich. Price, $1.00.

It is a genuine relief to turn from paradoxes, contradictions and obscure speculations, to read an author who makes clear and consistent statements. Dr. Meeter can be understood. He writes with the lucidity of a clear mind. He is the capable professor of Calvinism in Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich., an institution of the Christian Reformed Church of America. He and the college with which he is identified stand foursquare for the Bible as the infallible Word of God. And what is the fundamental principle of Calvin according to our author? It is the concept and recognition of God. "The Gottesbegrif, the God-concept, is therefore basic to the Calvinistic system," says Dr. Meeter (p. 53). While other systems center otherwise, the

Calvinistic system is theocentric. Hence the Westminster creed defines the chief end of man to be, "to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever." But what concept of God is the fundamental one? It is not "God as the absolute causality of all being," or "His infinite decree," or "His decree of predestination" (much as many people think so), or "the glory of God" (pp. 58, 59); but "the absolute sovereignty of God in the natural and moral spheres" (p. 71). Most forcibly does Dr. Meeter argue his case. As a Lutheran we might object to some of his implied criticisms of the Lutheran system. We cannot help believing, too, that the divine sovereignty is in nowise derogated by the freedom of man, because God created him as a free moral agent. But, while we cannot refrain from raising a few questions, we can say truthfully that Dr. Meeter has given us a very capable, and, withal, a kindly, presentation of the claims of the Calvinistic system.

The Problem of God. By Edgar Sheffield Brightman. The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Ave., New York; also Cincinnati and Chicago. Price $2.00.

The sum and substance of this profound and important book may be put in this way: it is an attempt to prove that God exists, that He is personal, wise and good, the Creator and Governor of the universe, but that He is limited by the *Given* in His own nature and by the free beings whom He has created. In the opening sentence of his preface he says: "The title of this book, *The Problem of God,* is intended to convey a triple meaning: that God is a problem to us, that we are a problem to Him, and (strange as it may sound) that God is a problem to Himself." The quoted sentence sets frankly before the reader just what the author's main thesis is.

In some respects this erudite book has much value. With logic as keen as a razor the author shows the inadequacy of the materialistic philosophies of the day—their failure to explain the phenomena of the universe, especially those of the highest qualitative value. He names many of the present-day advocates of atheism and agnosticism, quotes from their works and refutes their arguments. For example, he shows clearly that the unconscious could never give rise to the conscious by means of resident forces; there must have been a creative act or process to bring the "novel" (that is, the new) into existence. So likewise the nonpersonal could not have evolved into the personal. In this case we think that his argument against atheism is of smashing force. Thus he stoutly and convincingly upholds the doctrine of the personality and transcendence (p. 193), as well as the immanence, of God. If ever materialism was shown to be insufficient and irrational, that object has been accomplished in this important treatise.

However, in arguing for the doctrine of a finite God Dr. Brightman is not so profound, sagacious and logical. We are sorry for this. Had he expended his keen argumentative powers in showing that God is infinite in His being and attributes, he might have done much for the cause of true, thoroughgoing theism. Here the Bible would have helped him; but he never appeals to that holy Book; he even casts reflections here and there upon its statements. What makes him believe that God is limited? Answer: *The theory of evolution,* which he accepts without argumentation, or, as it were, just off the bat. The bloody struggle for existence surely could not have been ordained, he thinks, by an all-wise and infinite God; therefore evolution proves that He is limited—is struggling with His problems, and is laboriously trying to work out good in the world. Had our author gone to the Bible, he would have found that the present struggle for existence is not the result of God's decree and ordaining, but is the consequence of sin.

Now we cannot command the space to refute all of Dr. Brightman's arguments in favor of his doctrine of a limited God. Elsewhere in this magazine we shall touch upon some of them. But let us note a few points. If God were finite in power, He would some time become exhausted in upholding the universe, and it would drop into universal chaos. If God were not infinitely wise (omniscient), an emergency, for which He was not prepared, might some time arise in so vast and complex a universe, and that would spell universal ruin. Dr. Brightman admits that God is eternal; that He has always been existent, because, if there ever was a time when there was nothing, nothing could have ever come into existence. But if God is eternal, He must be infinite in all respects; He could not be infinite in one way, that of duration, and yet finite in other ways. Moreover, from the very nature of the case that which is eternal must be infinite. The *Given* in God—that is, His intrinsic nature and being—cannot limit Him, because, being eternal and uncreated, they must be infinite. There are no problems with God; no *lacunae,* no dark places, in God. "God is light, and in

Him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). The problem of evil and suffering can be best explained, not by the conception of a finite God, but by the permissive will and wisdom of an infinite God, who, in creating a universe containing free moral agents, knew that He could handle the situation, being infinite in wisdom, goodness and power, and therefore able to see the end from the beginning; yes, able to say to every opposing force, "Thus far shalt thou go and no further; here shall thy proud waves be stayed." "With God all things are possible." In His own infinite power, wisdom and goodness He can "bring good out of evil and make the wrath of man to praise Him." While "He giveth His beloved sleep," as well as peace and security, "He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep."

Biblical Confirmations from Archeology. By J. A. Huffman, D.D. The Standard Press, Pubs., Marion, Ind. Price, paper bound, 35 cents per copy; 3 copies, $1.00.

This valuable booklet comprises lectures delivered at a Bible School in Cincinnati, Ohio. They were received with so much favor and were so interesting and instructive, that it was decided to issue them in booklet form, so that they might be circulated far and wide. The chapters are indeed strengthening to faith in the historical verity of the Bible. The author canvasses the archeological findings that corroborate the Old Testament, among them being the early art of writing long before the time of Moses; the Code of Hammurabi; the discovery of the location of many cities mentioned in the Bible; the finding of the records of the Hittites; the Shepherd Kings of Egypt in the time of Joseph; the Moabite Stone; the Tell el Amarna Tablets; the great library at Nineveh in which were found the Babylonian stories of the creation, the fall of man and the Noachian Deluge. For the New Testament he describes a number of wonderfully corroborating facts, especially those discovered by Sir William Ramsay. He also vividly describes the finding and value of the Rosetta Stone and the Behistun Inscription, and shows how they furnished the key to the deciphering of the Egyptian and Babylonian languages respectively. The last chapter describes the author's personal experiences in Palestinian excavations during the summer of 1930. We hope this brochure will find many readers. Get it and read it, and then you will want to get and read his larger book, *Voices from Rocks and Dustheaps of Bible Lands.*

Christentum oder Religion? By Rev. Arno Clemens Gaebelein, D.D. Publication Office "Our Hope," 456 Fourth Ave., New York. Price $1.50.

In *The Bible Champion* for February, 1908, (p. 118) we reviewed with much favor the English edition of this valuable book. Its English title is *Christianity or Religion?* Its signal value lies in the fact that Dr. Gaebelein gives many reasons for the view that the origin of religion is best accounted for by the teaching of the Bible, and that the theory of evolution is futile along that line. Now Dr. Gaebelein's book has been translated and issued in Germany by a German publisher. Information comes that it is making quite a stir in German evangelical circles. We hope it will also stir the German liberalists out of their lethargy and self-assurance. Dr. Karl Barth was asked to write a "Vorvort" for the book, but declined to do so, saying, "This book does not need my endorsement; it will speak for itself." We are glad to know that this book has also come out in Spanish, Swedish, Bulgarian, and Chinese, while a French translation is now in process of making by a French evangelical leader, and also a Polish translation is near completion. At least two more of Dr. Gaebelein's books, *Die Welt der Engel* and *Die Judenfrage,* will appear during the present year in large German editions. We hope this beautiful German translation of Dr. Gaebelein's *Christianity or Religion?* will be widely read in America and other countries.

Word Studies in the New Testament. By Archibald T. Robertson, D.D. Richard R. Smith, Inc., Pubs., 12 East 41st Street, New York, N. Y. Price $3.50.

This is Volume III in a series of six volumes, and deals with the Acts of the Apostles. After a brief but valuable introduction, the author gives a detailed exegesis of the Acts, following the Greek text and pointing out the peculiar significance of most of the words. He reproduces the Greek text along with the English translation, but does not use the Greek alphabet. Thus the student who does not handle the Greek very readily can follow the exegesis. Dr. Robertson is so well known as an expert in the Greek of the New Testament that no words of praise are needed to convince the reader of the thoroughness and reliability of a work of this kind. Many important truths are brought out by such a close analysis of the text of Luke in the Acts. The work will be helpful to many people who are interested in Biblical interpretation. We believe that the

preacher, in preparing his sermons, might make effective use of the word studies in Dr. Robertson's series of books on the subject. Such studies will lead any one into the beauties and values of the Greek which St. Luke employed. Dr. Robertson defends Luke as a reliable historian in this volume, as he does to a much fuller extent in his previous volume, *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research.* In his introduction to this last volume he says: "In every instance where discoveries have been made they have confirmed the testimony of Luke," etc. He also cites the witness of Sir William Ramsay, who has, in so wonderful a way, vindicated the historical veracity of Luke.

The De Sacramento Altaris of William of Ockham. Edited and translated by Professor T. Bruce Birch, Ph.D.,D.D. The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington,, Iowa. Prices: English Text, $3.50; English and Latin Texts on opposite page, $6.00.

Readers who wish to probe deeply into philosophical problems will have all their desires met in this book. It belongs to the medieval period of philosophical speculation. The Latin title, *De Sacramento Altaris,* means "Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar," and therefore the book treats in a very profound way the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. By an immense amount of scholarly labor and research Dr. Birch has found, examined and translated a number of Ockham's manuscripts, some of them very hard to decipher. It certainly required a thorough knowledge of the Latin to perform the task of translating these difficult manuscripts. It is worth while to quote directly from Dr. Birch's Preface: "The object of this edition is to provide a text of the *De Sacramento Altaris* of William of Ockham based on the examination of three manuscripts and three text editions. It is hoped that this most important work, which is now easily accessible to scholars, may lead to a re-examination of the philosophical, psychological, theological and ecclesiastical problems of the stirring times of Ockham and his immediate successors. It is also hoped that this work may give rise to a renewed and careful study of Nominalism."

The editor has given "a rather literal translation" of Ockham's Latin text. William of Ockham—often spelled Occam—was born late in the thirteenth century, the precise date being unknown, and there is good authority for believing that he died in 1347. He was engaged in much controversy on theological topics, and his works were condemned as heretical by the pope of Rome and other Roman Catholic authorities. However, he persisted in advocating to the end what he believed to be the true Biblical principles, supported by profound philosophical reasoning. It is well-known that Luther was greatly indebted to Ockham in his (Luther's) development of the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The British philosopher had shown that glorified substance, such as the glorified humanity of our Lord is in His state of exaltation, can interpenetrate palpable substance, because Christ, after His resurrection, entered the upper room in Jerusalem where His apostles had met and when the doors were closed. From this fact in the gospels Luther drew his high and holy conception of the glorified humanity of Jesus Christ, having first found it, as he believed, to be the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. We are bound to say that this work of Ockham, now accessible to English readers, is of signal importance to people who wish to think deeply on theological and philosophical problems. While even the English translation may be difficult to master, it is worth while for leaders of thought to do so. Dr. Birch, the translater, is Professor of Philosophy in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

Uncle Sam's Attic: The Intimate Story of Alaska. By Mary Lee Davis. Illustrated by the author's photographs. W. A. Wilde Company, Boston. 1930. pp. 402. Price, $3.50.

While this is not a religious book, its spirit is so helpful to those who have to deal with men and women, as all ministers must, that it is profitable to all such who read it. It is not without its appeal as well to the religious in man; for its story of the Chinaman in Petersburg, on Wrangle Narrows, is a touching one. The town was in flames. He rushed into the street and shouted: " 'Jesus Clist flend to me! He now no burn me down!' The wind changed and the fire stopped dead at Sing Lee's store." Coincidence? Hardly. They prayed for rain in Oberlin once, and the only person able to get home at the close of the meeting was Dr. Finney. He had brought an umbrella!

This volume contains information that every educated American should know thoroughly, and that information cannot be had in any better form and more interesting guise than in this book, written by a woman who lived for eight years in close touch with Alaska's people, problems, resources, advantages, limitations, and everything else that comes within the ev-

eryday life of a citizen. We need more of the same sort of sympathetic understanding of other peoples and their problems and abilities. It is a good book to read, and ought to be in all our libraries—several copies of it.—*H. W. Magoun.*

Religion in a Changing World. By Abba Hillel Silver. Richard R. Smith, Inc., Pubs., East 41st Street, New York, N. Y. Price, $2.00.

The book reviewer of today has a difficult, albeit a delightful, task on his hands. The difficulty arises from the fact that so many books of today contain such a mixture of truth and error as to make it hard always to be discriminating, judicial and fair. Well, here is a book of the kind described. And what do you think? It is written by a Jewish Rabbi—not by a converted Jew, but by a Rabbi who retains his Hebrew integrity, although he belongs to the liberal school. He is brilliant and scholarly. He commands an engaging, facile style. We do not know of a recent writer who has such an abundant vocabulary and such a skillful command of the English language. So far as his style is concerned, his book makes fascinating reading. The work has many merits. No more cogent book has recently been published in favor of the theistic world-view and in criticism of the materialistic and atheistic propaganda of the day. Nor does he advocate the doctrine of a finite God, as do several other recent writers. With him religion and science are accordant as far as each is based on empirical findings. But the scientist has no right to invade the territory of religion and philosophy, and still hold that he dwells in the domain of pure science. Where, for example, has pure science ever proved that there is no God, or that man is not intuitively a religious being? His chapters on social justice, on world peace, on the American home, and on education and the good life are very good. Perhaps he wants the church and the synagogue to do too much along some of these lines. At least, to us it seems so. For old-fashioned Biblical morality our author is upstanding. The distinction between right and wrong is never to be blurred. He stands firm for monogamic marriage and its sacred character.

But, alas! that one must criticise so brilliant a book! Although the author says that religion must be "messianic," there is no Christ in it. No reflections are cast on Christianity, it is true; but neither is there any admission that Christ must be accepted, although He plainly taught that "no man cometh unto the Father but by" Him. Dr. Silver rather advocates the union of all religions in co-operative work for the world's welfare; but, we are glad to say, he does not believe in their merging into one religion. Such a union would be too colorless in doctrine even for him, liberal as he is. We believe it to be a serious fault, too, that Rabbi Silver believes in evolution (see pp. 25, 45, 95, 96). Yet he is not a *real* evolutionist, but an inconsistent one; for on page 46 (compare p. 45) he declares that "the hypothesis of creative intelligence is the only hypothesis which can account for the facts of experience." That would put the author into the class of creationists, for wherever something new is brought into existence, it would require a creative intervention on the part of God. The only trouble is that elsewhere he proclaims himself an evolutionist and believes that man has descended from a brute ancestry (p. 46, bottom, to top of page 47).

To show that he is a liberal and not an orthodox Hebrew, we cite page 45, where he says that, "however interesting the story of the creation of man" in the book of Genesis may be, "the sciences of biology and history have revealed a myriad-fold more dramatic and intriguing story of man's evolution and the ethnic anabasis of peoples." To this we cannot agree. The evolution of man from the beasts of the jungle by the gory struggle of existence may be "dramatic," but it is coarsely so; and, to our way of thinking, it is the very opposite of "intriguing." In spite of all the popular propagandism of the day, we hold to the old "dramatic and intriguing" doctrine of the direct and special creation of man as depicted in Gen. 1:27 and 2:7. Read these passages over and over again, and see how much more engaging and dignified is the Biblical doctrine of the origin of man than is the doctrine of his brute lineage.

* * *

Men, closet-trained in powerful prayer, and able by faith and fervor to lay hold on God in the public service, are needed to lead Christians in intercession. And in the pulpit. How wonderful the man who really prays! Heart burdened, passionately loving souls, in mighty faith in Christ, with great sweep of desire for a spiritual revival, seeing the deepest need of Christ's Church, how he agonizes, wrestles with God, cries with tears, and holds on until answered! God give us many such in our churches.—*Methodist.*

Our Serial---The Clamping of the Shackles

A story that deals effectively with some of the crucial questions that are now disrupting the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ

By Professor Glenn Gates Cole, Litt.D.

XXVII. A Mystery Solved

Every word one speaks becomes, to a certain extent, a living thing. Once set free, it can never be recalled. Words go on and on, from one hearer to another; and are liable to produce suggestions and actions that have likewise far-reaching consequences. You can never gather up all the blasted ruins wrought by your wicked actions and dangerous words.

BUT his questions were answered with a heart-deadening shock, when he, keeping his appointment, found himself fact to face with Otie Nelson!

For the instant there appeared nothing noticeably wrong with her, and she extended her hand and greeted Harker as she would an old-time friend from her former home. To be sure she had aged incredibly in the few months since he saw her last. There was a hectic flush about the cheeks, and lines of pain about the unhappy eyes. Harker shrank, aghast, from those eyes, and the deep sorrow they reflected.

Before he could say more than a few surprised commonplaces, the beautiful face of the girl changed to reflect the countenance of a lost soul. First, came a faltering look, as of a little child whose mind was blank. This gave way to a semblance of fear, which went over to a purple-red, angry visage. The girl's accusing eyes flashed, and words of ringing denunciation poured forth:

"You wily hypocrite! You emissary of the devil! You serpent in the guise of a messenger of God! How dare you come here to look upon my unhappiness? How dare you live, even?" Mrs. Donald strove to console and reassure the girl, and with partial success.

"You said we were animals!" she hissed. "And I believed you! You said the Bible was not true, and I believed you! You said divorce was right, and I believed you! You hideous caricature of a man! You low demon! See what you have done to me! I am lost—lost—lost!" And as she repeated this final word over and over, her voice died down, her vehemence softened, and she sank back exhausted into the arms of her companion. Mrs. Donald signalled for him to go.

He withdrew to an outer room and sank into a chair. For the time there was no strength left to carry him further. The remembrance of that distorted face, those accusing eyes, those reviling words, all but stopped his heart. It sickened him, and he felt faint. If he had accused himself of an unintended injury to his egotistical assumptions before his flock at Warburton, he now found a serious crime in the awful effects his teachings had produced. The unexpected defection of Otie Nelson from the path of rectitude as Wanda had feared, was all too true; and he, Peyton Harker, was the cause. He groaned in agony.

After a quarter of an hour, during which the words of the deranged girl had gradually ceased, Mrs. Donald came forth to join him in the outer room.

"She is sleeping now," she informed him.

"This affair has almost killed me," he assured her. "I have never felt so like a veritable murderer in all my life. If I could persuade myself that I am all responsible, I should feel that I had unwittingly been a cause for dooming both body and soul to an awful ruin. Tell me, Mrs. Donald, am I responsible? You say you have picked up the complete story of the girl; I must know about it!"

The woman looked with an affectionate pity upon his suffering. Peyton had, and always would occupy, a sacred place in her heart's affection. His defection from her had made her exceptionally bitter towards him at first, but all that was gone now. At this time, there was nothing but pitying love for him.

"You shall know her history, and it is right you should," Mrs. Donald began. "Just as you can never be entirely freed from the effects of the life you lived at the university, just so you will always find yourself reaping the evil

from your false teachings to your congregation at Warburton. Every word one speaks, becomes to a certain extent a living thing. Once set free, it can never be recalled. They go on and on, from one hearer to another; and are liable to produce suggestions and actions that have likewise far-reaching consequences. You can never gather up all the blasted ruins wrought by your wicked actions and dangerous words. But you might, through strenuous effort, partly offset your evil by acts and words of righteousness and truth the remainder of your life. You may be surprised at this attitude in me, Peyton Harker, for I am not the Bessie Wright of your university days, nor even the Mrs. Donald of your Pittsburgh meeting, for I have learned some lessons too. I confess that when Mr. Mason hired me for a companion for his—his—his wife, I planned to extort from his guilt, dishonest blackmail. It was a wonderful opportunity, and I was wicked enough to want to exploit it. But alone, with poor Mrs. Mason, my attitude changed. In the wreck of the pure soul of the once happy girl, I grew ashamed; and have come to suffer in her pain as her own sister might.

"We do not know what the future holds for her. The doctors can not tell. I do not know whether the wicked elopement alone is responsible for her condition or not. If so, we do not hope that she will ever be better, but I shall cling to the poor girl as long as she lives. There is a slight possibility, however, that some unknown burden aside from that, is responsible for her condition, and if so, we may discover the cause and by removing it, give her a chance for a semblance of sanity and a happier life. But she will never be entirely free from her insanity.

"I want to begin her story to you, by telling something that has occurred recently, and then go back to the beginning. Mr. Mason was granted his divorce from Stella last week; and he came down last Tuesday with the proper papers and authorities and married Otie. So, on the surface, she is relieved of that worry, but she does not know that we are all aware that a marriage with an insane woman is not only illegal, but criminal. We do not want her to know this, for if she realized it, she would not live a day. She is a broken-hearted woman as it is. When I saw the enormous evil and injustice of it all, for the first time, I denounced a God who would let such evil things exist; but in my sober afterthoughts, I knew that it was not God's doing but man's wickedness that had caused it all. And, Peyton Harker, do you know that back of it, you are the one who must be held responsible for Guy Mason's wickedness and Otie Nelson's weakness?"

She paused. If she had expected him to attempt a reply to her question, she was disappointed, for he realized without argument that she was right; although it had not yet been brought home to him in what way he was responsible. But she continued, by way of enlightening him:

"You want her story; well, I shall tell it to you. I know all the circumstances as well as if I had dwelt in Warburton all my life. I know the events though I do not know personally all the characters involved.

"Until your pastorate at Warburton, Otie Nelson was such a girl as brings joy and happiness to friends. She was just such a modest, whole-souled, virtuous girl as becomes the idol of a real man's heart. In an evil hour, she let her romantic, girlish affection become centered upon a man of supposed great worth. But he was a man, who capable of great things and good, could be discouraged and yield to evil things. He was an officer in your church; and as such, came under your influence, and gave himself up to your attitude of thinking. Did you preach a sermon on divorce, at one time in Warburton?"

"I recall that I did," Peyton admitted, without evasion. Face to face with his evil heart, he had no wish to prevaricate.

"That sermon meant little to you," she resumed. "It was merely a topic for a sermon, nothing more. It also gave you an opportunity to air your personal idiosyncrasies in a sensational way, and flatter your independence and egotism. But you can never know the effects of that sermon as long as time shall last. In that man's life, it was the turning-point. He was infatuated with Otie, and home conditions discouraged him. The restraint of Christian teaching concerning divorce had been stripped off by that sermon; the legal latitude in divorce had been substituted in his mind. With your attitude his own, he saw no evil in severing the relationship which was right, and entering upon an entanglement that was debasingly wrong. So his evil course since that is but the expected fruit of the vine you nurtured.

"Now, as to Otie. She was at an age that needed some standard to enable her to decide between right and wrong. In her inexperience, she could not generalize from the practice of

society any such standard as you advocated. She had been taught a reverence for the Bible and Christian doctrine. You awakened doubts in her mind as to the truth of the Bible. Naturally, she decided that it was not a satisfactory standard by which to decide her perplexing questions and give her adequate ideas as to what is right and what is wrong. Every moral consideration was swept away. Then you filled her mind with other theories which did her no good.

"I gather from Mrs. Mason's case, that it is all very well for a highly trained scholar to have erratic theories, and do themselves little harm. But when they pass these out to those who accept them as facts instead of theories, they become immeasurably unsettling. When a scholarly man, like yourself, knowing the value of these theories as theories, present them as facts to those who listen to you, you are doing a vast injustice, and promoting a great fraud. If I were to grant that the Bible be but a spurious Revelation and merely literature as your authorities claim, what are we going to give the people to take its place? They must have a standard for testing right and wrong in morals—and for an authority in religion. What do you give them? Nothing! The nearest that you come to it, is to advise them to adjust their morals and religion to the practices of society. Well! Mr. Mason and Otie both did this and see where they are now. And then, to add injury to injury, you went a step further, and taught this discredited theory of evolution as the universal scientific law! The animal nature of man must predominate in morals, society, and business. What kind of morality and religion can be based upon a theory upheld by the 'survival of the fittest' teaching? It is just such crude theories as yours, Peyton Harker, that is ruining the young people of our times!"

At this instant, there was a crash in the inner room, and Otie threw open the door, wild-eyed and dishevelled.

"Guy killed Wanda Reese!" she screamed in a shrill, blood-curdling cry. Then, her demented eyes rested upon Peyton, and she flung herself at his feet. "Oh, Mr. Harker! He told me—he told me!" she chattered. Harker reached down and lifted her face, so he could look into her eyes.

"No; no, Otie! Be calm! Wanda is alive. I had a letter from her yesterday. It is in my pocket now. Do you want to see it?"

For a full half minute, she searched his face, as though confirming his truthfulness; then she twisted convulsively for an instant, and with a low moan, slipped senseless upon the floor.

The two bore her tenderly to her couch, and Mrs. Donald applied restoratives. Finally, there was a twitching of the eyelids, a movement of the lips, and the unfortunate girl struggled back to consciousness. Peyton left the room, feeling that every sight of him infuriated her. But in a few minutes, Mrs. Donald called him back.

"She is asking for you," she explained. "I never heard her make that statement before about Miss Reese. Do you suppose she knows the secret of Miss Reese's accident?"

"Instead, I think it is merely an insane fantasy," he replied. "But we shall see."

Peyton found the girl palpitatingly eager to talk. Surprisingly, she appeared quite normal and intelligent.

"What was it you said about Wanda being alive and well?" she asked.

For reply he drew a letter from his pocket. "Here is a letter I received from her yesterday. She is truly alive and well. She was almost killed a few months ago at Pittsburgh, but has fully recovered from that. Here, you know her writing! Look at the letter! See the signature!"

With slowly believing eyes, she did as directed. "It is strange," she insisted. "Guy said she was dead, and told me he killed her. I wonder if he knows?"

"Tell me all about it, Otie," he commanded her. "I think some mistake has been made. But there is no mistake about Wanda's being alive. She is quite well, though she did have a narrow escape."

The girl closed her eyes for a few minutes, and remained quiet. Then, she opened them, and sat up.

"You don't know how that relieves me," she said. "The secret was killing me. It was making me afraid of Guy. And since I have said so much about it, I must explain it all."

"Yes; tell me all about it," Peyton insisted. It was plain to him that the mysterious assault upon Wanda was to be explained at last.

* * *

"If your lips would keep from slips,
Five things observe with care;
Of whom you speak, to whom you speak
And how, and when and where."

In the Editor's Mail

Dr. Fosdick on Prayer

FREDERICK HASSKARL, A.M.,B.D.

IN THE January issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE appeared a succinct, incisive, lucid article entitled *Dr. Fosdick's Attitude on Prayer for Rain.* That article has rooted my attention to the question of prayer as never before. I am asking myself, what is prayer? The last paragraph of Dr. Sloan's editorial goes to the very heart of the matter.

> Personally I could pray eagerly for rain only under the circumstances that I felt I did deeply understand God's providential order. I would not care to lift my little personal desire with insistance in prayer because my point of view is inevitably very limited; but if I could feel that God in His wisdom, waited to bless us with rain and our hearts with the blessedness of answered prayer, the gift of rain, I could pray for it, and pray for it with confidence.

This paragraph has led me to the following reflection:

Was it not the "thousand-souled Bard of Avon" who said, "At their wit's ends all men pray?" Was it not the so-called Christian pagan, Wolfegang Von Goethe, thinker, poet, statesman, scientist, the last of the "universalists" who, facing the problem of life, reality, said in contempt of man's philosophizing rationalism, "With all your philosophy you cannot entice a dog from back of the warm stove?"

Both of these sayings apply to the eminent Dr. Fosdick, for every Sunday, over the radio, he offers deeply emotional prayers, asking our Heavenly Father to intervene in the spiritual affairs of men,—but such an intervention is as much an invasion of the established order of the universe as is contemplated by those who pray that God will send us rain.

In complete agreement with the concluding paragraph of Dr. Sloan's editorial quoted above, I do not pray for rain. Shall I tell you why? Our gracious and loving Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to us the Father's will. I have two boys who are at school. My prayer is that both of them will enter the Christian ministry. Yet I do not ask Him in whom we live and move and have our being to fulfill my personal choice; rather I commune with God about this hope of my heart. I do not seek to dictate. To my mind this distinction is the secret of all truly Christian prayer.

Was it not Dr. Philip Schaff who said, "Luther's Catechism is next to the Bible the greatest exposition of the Holy Scriptures, and does not Luther say in his explanation of the third petition of the Lord's Prayer, "The good and gracious will of God is done indeed without our prayer; but we pray in this petition that it may be done by us also."

Here indeed is a mighty thought. My dear old German grandmother fell asleep in the Lord at the age of 83. I was then a little boy. She had had a thorough education in Marbach, the city of Schiller. During many days and nights of my early childhood my parents entrusted me to her care. Her prayer life is a never-dying memory. I can still hear her praying as we sat around the table, "Come Lord Jesus, be Thou our Guest, And bless what Thou hast given!"

We children had an unconscious sense of reverence for the religion of *Grossmutter*—in her presence. Often I have seen her sitting with her Bible before her, either looking intensely upon its pages, or else with deep thought gazing fixedly into space. To our question "What are you doing, *Grossmutter?*", the answer always came, "Ich bete" (I am praying). "How can you pray when you are reading?" we would reply. "Oh," she would say, kindly, "here is the will of God; I wanted to find out His will regarding a certain matter."

My mother raised a family of ten children; I am the seventh. Six of us are living. We are all actively identified with the Christian Church as also are the grandchildren. Why is this? Let me give you one of the many reasons. On Christmas-eve mother would put us very early to bed, and after the usual prayers, kneeling at the bed-side, as was the tradition in our family, she told us the sweetest of all

stories, the story of Jesus' coming to earth. She knew how to bring the story home. She knew how to answer the thousand and one questions of her children. Before leaving us she would always say, "Now you see what the Heavenly Father wants; He wants you children to do your parents' will; to see that they know best,—and how much more does our Heavenly Father know best! So, children, take His loving gracious will always as your first consideration."

I shall always be able to see my father just before he went away from home on a journey praying: "Father, Thou knowest before we ask all that we need. Thou art more ready to help us than we are to petition Thee." Invariably his prayers centered around this thought. Here is another of his prayers that I remember from my childhood. "Father, as children to their parents we come to Thee with many requests. Forgive them. Above all things teach us Thy will. May we do as Thou wouldst have us do; then all will be well with our beloved."

And as he prayed, so it was, and so it is. One often reads how Luther stormed the throne of God when his beloved daughter Magdalena was dying. We are apt to forget that before he finished his prayer he fell on his knees, and committing his Magdalena to God, asked that the Father's will be done. When Philipp Melanchthon was in the throes of death, the great reformer again in his impetuous way almost dictated to God; but he finally added, "Thy will be done." Magdalena was taken. Melanchthon was spared. Does not history reveal the truth of God's loving, gracious will as Luther so well called it?

To my mind the trouble is that too often our prayers are selfish, self-centered, thoughtless of God's eternal purpose. This summer I met a farmer. Everything on his property indicated his care and prosperity. To be sure the effects of the dry weather were easily to be seen. He said to me, "What are the pastors doing about this drought? Are they praying for rain? If we don't get it soon, all of us farmers will suffer big losses this year." Nevertheless this man who so earnestly desired prayer for rain had not been at a Church service in 30 years. His entire family had grown up without contact with Christ. To him bumper crops were vastly more important than human souls. In raising his children he did not need either worship or prayer; but when his crops withered, he wanted prayer.

What is prayer? According to Professor Einstein, science *per se* knows nothing of aesthetics or morality, "therefore," he continues, "for men as scientists, they do not exist." The same is true of religion, but Einstein maintains as he looks around this world and examines himself, he knows that aesthetics, morality, religion, are real. He knows they are real because they were necessary to the development of his life as a man and a scientist. These are in general the thoughts he wrote for *The Forum* a few months ago. To science *per se* "love" is non-existent. Yet as Leo Tolstoy has well said, "It is what men live by."

Please, however, do not count me among those who are at odds with science. I believe in science; but I disagree with the all-wise, worldly-wise, atheistic science which enthrones itself as infallible. Science *per se* is but one of the many branches of knowledge as Einstein intimates. Many seem to have forgotten that the word itself means knowledge. Now, when we put together all the branches of knowledge, we know that what is true of one is true of the others—as St. Paul said, "We know but in part." Often we think we possess the whole, though in this life it is always only a part.

For myself I still hold to the truth of that sentence in the prayer of our Lord: "This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." I shall continue to pray, but just as my children come to me with petitions, born in the moment of their childish enthusiasm, petitions which I cannot fulfill, and which I should not fulfill, so I shall understand that in my coming to the Father with my plea for this and that, He too must often deny my requests. Prayer is the communion of the soul with God, and increasingly I draw closer to Him. I learn how good and loving His gracious will is. The poet Jane Borthwick has beautifully translated a stanza of one of the dear old German hymns that is most appropriate:

My Jesus, as Thou wilt!
O may Thy will be mine!
Into Thy hand of love
I would my all resign.
Through sorrow, or through joy,
Conduct me as Thine own,
And help me still to say
My Lord, Thy will be done.

Wilmington, Delaware.

* * *

There are logicians in the world to-day, and there are geologists; but the logicians are not geologists; the geologists are not always logicians.